S. HRG. 314

EFFECTIVENESS OF FEDERAL FOOD, NUTRITION, AND SURPLUS COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT, OVERSIGHT, AND INVESTIGATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JUNE 13, 1983

DENVER, COLO.

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

24-124 O WASHINGTON: 1983

S161-23

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

JESSE HELMS, North Carolina, *Chairman*

BOB DOLE, Kansas
RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
RUDY BOSCHWITZ, Minnesota
ROGER W. JEPSEN, Iowa
PAULA HAWKINS, Florida
MARK ANDREWS, North Dakota
PETE WILSON, California
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah

WALTER D. HUDDLESTON, Kentucky
PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont
EDWARD ZORINSKY, Nebraska
JOHN MELCHER, Montana
DAVID H. PRYOR, Arkansas
DAVID L. BOREN, Oklahoma
ALAN J. DIXON, Illinois
HOWELL HEFLIN, Alabama

GEORGE S. DUNLOP, *Chief of Staff*
J. ROBERT FRANKS, *General Counsel*
CARL P. ROSE, *General Counsel and Staff Director for the Minority*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT, OVERSIGHT, AND INVESTIGATIONS

MARK ANDREWS, North Dakota, *Chairman*

JESSE HELMS, North Carolina

DAVID H. PRYOR, Arkansas
PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont

CONTENTS

	Page
Andrews, Hon. Mark, a U.S. Senator from North Dakota, opening statement	1
Hollings, Hon. Ernest F., a U.S. Senator from South Carolina	4

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

Young, Hon. Coleman A., mayor, Detroit, Mich., and president, U.S. Conference of Mayors	5
Answers to questions of Senator Helms by Mayor Young	127
Fulton, Hon. Richard H., mayor, Nashville, Tenn	9
Answers to questions of Senator Helms by Mayor Fulton, with attached supporting material	13
Padilla, Hon. Hernan, mayor, San Juan, P.R	21
Holland, Hon. Arthur J., mayor, Trenton, N.J	24
Answers to questions of Senator Helms by Mayor Holland	27
Morial, Hon. Ernest N., mayor of New Orleans, La	31
Answers to questions of Senator Helms by Mayor Morial	120
Feinstein, Hon. Dianne, mayor, San Francisco, Calif	34
Answers to questions of Senator Helms by Mayor Feinstein	38
Barry, Hon. Marion, Jr., mayor, Washington, D.C	41
Answers to questions of Senator Helms by Mayor Barry	45
Wessman, Hon. H. C. "Bud," mayor, Grand Forks, N. Dak	48
Answers to questions of Senator Helms by Mayor Wessman	50
Collins, Jane, director, clinical social work, Department of Health and Hospitals, Denver, Colo	53
Stark, Alice R., director, Central Denver Community Service, Denver, Colo	56
Pennetta, Lynn, coordinator, community food and nutrition program, Denver Opportunity, Inc., Denver, Colo	59
Answers to questions of Senator Helms by Ms. Pennetta	61
Cantwell, Hendrika B., M.D., consulting pediatrician, Department of Social Services, Denver, Colo	62
Exchange of correspondence between Chairman Helms and Senator Andrews, clarifying an erroneous news report, with attached article from the Washington Post	65

APPENDIX

Helms, Hon. Jesse, a U.S. Senator from North Carolina, statement	69
Huddleston, Hon. Walter D., a U.S. Senator from Kentucky, letter dated June 9, 1983, to Senator Helms	84
Hollings, Hon. Ernest F., a U.S. Senator from South Carolina, statement	84
Hart, Hon. Gary, a U.S. Senator from Colorado, statement	86
Young, Hon. Coleman A., mayor, Detroit, Mich., and president, U.S. Conference of Mayors, statement, with attached letter from William S. Woodside, American Can Co., dated June 13, 1983	87
Fulton, Hon. Richard H., mayor, Nashville, Tenn., statement	89
Holland, Hon. Arthur J., mayor, Trenton, N.J., statement	92
Morial, Hon. Ernest N., mayor, New Orleans, La., statement	93
Feinstein, Hon. Dianne, mayor, San Francisco, Calif., statement	94
Barry, Hon. Marion, Jr., mayor, Washington, D.C., statement	96
Wessman, Hon. H. C. "Bud," mayor, Grand Forks, N. Dak., statement with attachments	99
Stark, Alice R., director, Central Denver Community Service, Denver, Colo., statement	111
Pennetta, Lynn, coordinator, community food and nutrition program, Denver Opportunity, Inc., Denver, Colo., statement	113
Cantwell, Hendrika B., M.D., consulting pediatrician, Department of Social Services, Denver, Colo., statement	115
Excerpts from a report by the Office of Inspector General, USDA, regarding overissuances in the food stamp program	117

EFFECTIVENESS OF FEDERAL FOOD, NUTRITION, AND SURPLUS COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS

MONDAY, JUNE 13, 1983

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT,
OVERSIGHT, AND INVESTIGATIONS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY,
Denver, Colo.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:30 p.m., Hon. Mark Andrews (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senator Andrews.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARK ANDREWS, A U.S. SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

Senator ANDREWS. The subcommittee will come to order. I want to welcome all of you to this public hearing before the U.S. Conference of Mayors, conducted by the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Subcommittee on Rural Development, Oversight, and Investigations.

As chairman of this subcommittee I want to point out that our topic of oversight will be the examination and effectiveness of Federal food, nutrition, and surplus commodity distribution programs, particularly with respect to the response of these programs to the emerging problem of hunger in American cities.

Newspaper reports and television newscasts have reported in recent months that many of our fellow Americans are suffering from hunger and malnutrition. In addition, there are many who fear that they may not be able to afford adequate diets if their economic circumstances continue to decline.

Judge Learned Hand said:

> A society in which each is unwilling to surrender only that for which he can see a personal equivalent is not a society at all. It is a group already in the process of dissolution.

I think that's why we are concerned today, and what we want to explore today with our witnesses is the question of what is really happening in our cities. Are Federal programs adequate? Do they adequately serve the needs of all who have experienced the loss of employment? The poor? The children of the poor? Should we do more? How can we do a better job of eliminating hunger? What policies need to be changed? Which ones are adequate?

You may be interested in knowing that a survey completed approximately 2 weeks ago by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities of Washington, D.C., showed that the number of Americans seeking

emergency food aid from soup kitchens and food pantries grew dramatically last year.

The study found that in over half of the 180 emergency food programs examined, the number of persons served grew by more than 50 percent in the 12-month period from February 1982 to February 1983.

Over one-third of the emeregncy programs surveyed doubled in size during this period. In addition, three-fourths of the emergency food programs reported serving more families with children than 1 year earlier.

During the past year, according to the survey, a larger number of unemployed and those whose food stamps had run out sought aid from emergency food programs. Over 90 percent of the emergency food programs in the survey reported that a significant portion of the people they served in February 1983 were unemployed, and that more of the persons they served were unemployed than had been the case 1 year earlier.

Eighty-eight percent of the programs also reported that a significant portion of those served asked for aid because their food stamps did not provide enough food to last through the month—food stamp benefits average 47 cents per person per meal. Over 80 percent of the agencies providing emergency aid reported more people seeking help because their food stamps had run out than were reported a year earlier.

The study found that in many areas, the sharp increases in the number of persons seeking assistance affected how the emergency food services were provided. Nearly one-fourth of the agencies had to turn people away during the year.

About three months ago I visited a church in the downtown Washington area, a church that conducts a feeding operation. I went there at noon. I was welcomed by the priest in this church who came up to me and he said, "Senator, you are the third Senator who has come but you are the first one who has come without television cameras. Welcome!"

I sat down and had lunch, a nutritious lunch, with an individual retired from Woodward and Lothrop Department Store who was approximately 74 years old. His dispensations from Social Security simply didn't go far enough. If it weren't for that hot meal at noon that he and his wife received he could not make it.

But the tragedy was that when I went back into the kitchen and visited with the volunteers, I saw them preparing the evening meal. They said they received their food by going through the dumpsters, and the waste food at Eastern Market. They took the collection plate proceeds and bought chicken backs for $1 a dozen to put in the stew.

I looked in the kitchen and I said, "Are there any surplus commodities?" No; not one pound of surplus flour, not one pound of pasta products, not one pound of powdered milk or supplements that we do have. Yet, we were told that our commodity distribution programs were in fact working. Not too long after that, of course, we had testimony from the Department of Agriculture telling us how well they were working.

We have since put into the jobs bill—I say this for the mayors who are here and this is one of the questions we are going to ask them—some $100 million to see that these commodities do move through. It

was reduced to $50 million in conference with the House. Senator Hollings and I were in that conference, and we want to see now how that $50 million is working.

The study that I cited ended prior to the provisions of that 1983 jobs bill providing funds for the distribution of Federal commodities. So, we are going to be interested in what our witnesses have to say regarding the present validity of this study.

Before we hear from our witnesses, I want to emphasize the bipartisan nature of the Federal food, nutrition, and commodity distribution programs. When hunger was discovered in America in the sixties, it became the concern of Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike, all thoughtful people. Certainly, I believe there is a strong feeling in the United States that no one should be allowed to be hungry or malnourished, unless by personal choice. This feeling is strong, because we are a land of substantial agricultural abundance, unmatched in the history of the world. In addition, we have a long and outstanding tradition of being a caring and compassionate people who repond to the trials and tribulations of other nations. And right here at home, of course, as the mayors know and as those of you in the audience know, people are well ahead of their government.

Out in North Dakota, our North Dakota farmers—and they are, Mayor Young, might I say, the economic group most closely approximate to automobile workers today—perceived that problem, and in North Dakota alone they raised money to collect several thousand bushels of wheat, have it milled into flour, and sent into your city, Detroit.

Another group of farmers in my home State of North Dakota put together some Durham wheat, had it milled and made into pasta products and sent to the city of Cleveland.

I may be following my constituents. They are ahead of me. This concern shows how Americans really feel, and I think those of us in government ought to make sure that things are followed through.

Also, I believe this hearing is important because we are going to hear specifically about hunger in our cities from those who know best.

The modern city is one of our society's greatest achievements. But we know that many American cities today are going through a lot of trials and tribulations, very tough trying circumstances. They are fragile. They don't have enough money, enough housing, or enough employment for their residents. One thing they don't need is for many of their citizens to be hungry as well. I find this especially true, because allowing hunger and malnutrition to occur in the United States side by side with agricultural surpluses, demonstrates mismanagement, inefficiency, and a lack of foresight.

Might I say one other thing. If you want to be a flinty-hard character that doesn't give a darn about people and you don't care about the hunger of people, all you are interested in is the dollar, then by golly, that dollar invested in nutrition programs is a darned good investment because it is going to save the Federal taxpayers from having to spend $4 or $5 down the line to take care of the medical needs of the individual who is malnourished early on.

Today, we are fortunate in having the mayors of eight cities, as well as several local citizens, who have been involved with the subject we are addressing to testify before this committee.

I am also very proud and pleased to have my good friend and colleague, Senator Hollings from South Carolina, to share the podium with me. Senator Huddleston, the ranking Democrat on the Agriculture Committee, has written me a letter, and I would like to make it a part of the record, asking that Senator Hollings sit in for Senator Leahy in the subcommittee hearing.[1] Senator Leahy has accompanied me to a number of these hearings. It is almost more like home to have Fritz with me because Fritz and I have served on the Appropriations and Budget Committee in the Senate and I have the deepest affection and greatest respect for him.

It is good to have you here, Senator Hollings. Would you have a comment or two to make in this opening statement?

STATEMENT OF HON. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, A U.S. SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

Senator HOLLINGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me first commend the chairman. I know all of us in the Congress talk about a balanced budget. The great need really is for balanced Senators, and we have one here in the chairman, Senator Mark Andrews of North Dakota. I have served with him on the Appropriations and Budget Committee. He has a heart, I know, from his recognition and treatment of the social, agricultural, and urban problems facing our Nation today. He has a head and knows how to look at things realistically. He knows that investments in our human infrastructure are in the best interests of this country. Thus, I am not a bit surprised to see him head up this particular field hearing.

I want to commend the Conference of Mayors, Mayor Young, you and your friend Dick Fulton, and particularly, of course, the American Can Co. in sponsoring this report on hunger in eight cities in America. The fact of the matter is there is a tremendous feeling of frustration in America because we thought we had solved the problem of hunger until just about a year or so ago.

Back in 1968, Congress asked the Surgeon General of the United States how many hungry people lived in America. He replied that the Public Health Service had studied hunger in 33 countries around the world but never in the United States.

So, we gave the Public Health Service the authority, the funding, and the mandate to investigate and report on the state of hunger in America. Three years later, after traveling through 10 States and making 81,000 complete physical examinations, it was concluded that there were 12 million hungry Americans.

Upon receiving these startling findings, we instituted womens' and infants' and children's feeding programs, outreach programs, meals on wheels, and the different nutritional approaches to extinguish the blemish of hunger, and thought we were doing well. But now with the recession/depression of the last 2 years it has gone from our children to our senior citizens. It has gone from those who have never had a job to the working people who just lost their job, and has gone out from the rural areas down into the inner city where people are crowded together in the church halls and the soup lines.

---

[1] See p. 84 for the letter from Senator Huddleston.

Senator Andrews mentioned the fact of the investment. I will mention that and file my remaining prepared remarks so we can really hear from the mayors.

We have found from medical studies that you have 13 billion brain cells and I have 13 billion. Ten of the thirteen are developed the first 5 months in the mothers womb, and due to a lack of nutrition, due to a lack of protein during pregnancy there is as much as 20 percent less brain cell development. We call it organic damage. A child born without total development, without ability to concentrate, is not educable. It is much like taking a TV set with thousands of wires and circuits, throwing it on the floor and putting it back on the table, turning it on and finding out that it doesn't work. There are billions of cellular connections in the human brain that become undone, and there we start. I can tell you categorically that such a child will be too big for the first grade and the second grade, and back down into the streets, into mischief, and before long into crime. And we learned some years back it is cheaper to feed the child than it is to jail a man.

And now, Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me, I would ask the unanimous consent that the remainder of my statement in its entirety be included.[1]

Senator Andrews. Senator, without objection it will be.

There may be some differences of opinion, but I have no doubt that each person and each city represented in this hearing cares deeply about the nutrition of our people. In addition, all of you care about finding an answer and the solution to making this program work.

So, let us begin, Mayor Young, you are the first witness.

Let me inform the witnesses at the beginning, and I will do this a number of times through the hearing. As is traditional in a Senate hearing, your entire prepared remarks will appear in the record, which is what our staff will be studying, as though you gave every word. So, if you would like to summarize in any way you want and leave a little more time for questions, that will be fine. This would make a more complete record.

STATEMENT OF HON. COLEMAN A. YOUNG, MAYOR, DETROIT, MICH., AND PRESIDENT, U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

Mayor Young. Thank you very much, Senator Andrews and Senator Hollings.

I do have prepared remarks which I will submit. I will try to briefly summarize the contents.[1]

As you know, one of the most significant developments in the Conference of Mayors in the fight against hunger was the agreement we achieved about a year ago at a public/private conference in New York. American Can Co. agreed to join with us in the research necessary to give some documentary evidence of the ravages of hunger in this country, and I have with me a copy of that report which I will also submit to you. "Hunger in American Cities." [1]

I also have a letter from William S. Woodside, who is chairman of the American Can Co., who speaks of the cooperation with the Con-

[1] See p. 84 for the prepared statement of Senator Hollings and p. 87 for the prepared statement of Mayor Young. The report "Hunger in American Cities" is retained in committee files; see also, p. 127 for written questions from Senator Helms and Mayor Young's answers thereto.

ference of Mayors in the production of this report and who indicates that, as a private institution, I should offer appreciation to you, Senator, for the work of your committee, and an indication that American Can intends to continue in the next year making through its Foundation in the fight against hunger an attempt to develop a campaign to deal with hunger as a primary objective. I am relaying Mr. Woodside's message to this committee.

Senator ANDREWS. We will make Mr. Woodside's message a part of your testimony, Mayor.[1]

Mayor YOUNG. The study which the U.S. Conference of Mayors put together involved a detailed examination of hunger in eight cities, those cities being Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Nashville, New Orleans, Oakland, Rochester, and San Antonio. You can see in the report that although conditions might vary, that is, the level of unemployment, and in some cities homelessness was considered a more stringent emergency condition than hunger, but in all cities both hunger and homelessness were major problems which have been completely underestimated in the past.

For instance, in Detroit, in my own city, after careful review and study of the constantly reported conditions of hunger we took a look at hunger in our city. We have five or six soup kitchens. I have visited some of those soup kitchens, as both of you have, and I was surprised to come across what has been since described as "the new face of hunger." I had been to those soup kitchens before and generally you find at a soup kitchen or in the past you have found the derelicts who had been victims of our society and who certainly deserve our attention but they came in as a distinct class. If you look at soup kitchens around the Nation today you will find whole families in those soup lines. You will find an increasing number of women as well as men.

We also have food distribution centers where demand has been constantly growing, and I am sure you are aware, since your committee has an oversight function, of the Government's distribution of surplus commodities such as cheese. We had recently in Detroit in excess of 100,000 people come out for the distribution of 25,000 pounds of cheese. You have got to be pretty damn hungry to stand in line for 1 hour, or 2 or 3 hours for 5 pounds of cheese. But this is a constant problem that we have been able to notice in our city.

As a result of these studies I declared a state of emergency in the city. We know, and I knew then, that I had no real basis for declaring a state of emergency as the mayor. That function is carried out by the Governor. And, generally, in this country states of emergency are reserved for acts of God like floods, tornadoes, et cetera. But I submit that acts of man, that's what hunger is, or maybe inaction of man, can be just as devastating, if not more so, than acts of God.

I declared a state of emergency and called upon our Governor to issue a similar declaration. After several weeks of study throughout the State—and he found it wasn't only Detroit, it was all over the State—a state of emergency was declared in Michigan. I don't think we have had anything like that since the last depression.

It was that declaration, Senator, of the state of emergency and the publicity attendant to it that received the response that you noted from

---

[1] See p. 89 for the letter from the American Co. to Mayor Young.

the farmers, and I might note that the uniform response from across the Nation and, yes, even as far away as Germany, has been great. We have collected over $100,000, well over $100,000, for the mayor's emergency relief fund, which I reactivated. Frank Murphy had started that back in the thirties for the same purpose, soup kitchens. We have reactivated it.

There are some who feel ashamed, think there is a political stigma attached to receiving the food donations from Germany. But most of the food donations and the money we received were accompanied by touching notes, letters, which indicated that the Germans were attempting to return to us in the United States today some of the kindness we extended to them back in the days when they were on their knees right after World War II.

Senator ANDREWS. There may be problems though, Mayor Young. Senator Hollings mentioned Jean Mayer, the president of Tufts University, who is a leading nutritionist. Dr. Mayer testified before this committee about 2 months ago. He pointed out the foreign nations that were sending food aid into the United States. As an old French resistance fighter he said that their concern and their caring is indeed touching, but it is damaging to our Nation because we are putting ourselves into the posture vis-a-vis our European friends and the other countries of this troubled world, of being a Nation that can't handle its responsibility to its own people. While we talk about putting Pershing missiles and all the rest of the armaments over into Europe, as Dr. Mayer points out, we are missing some of the strength that is America's; the unique productivity of our farms and our farm families, as well as the unique ability we have to make sure that no one in our Nation goes hungry.

I served with Dr. Mayer some years ago as a delegate from the Congress to the Food and Agricultural Organization in the United Nations, and those 140 nations respected us more for the food we could produce than the fact we could land a man on the moon and blow the world up 10 times over with our nuclear arsenals.

Mayor YOUNG. I think the response from Germany, if it makes us take a second look at ourselves, makes us take a second look at our failure to utilize our productive capacity to feed our own people, then I would say the Germans have done us a good service, however inadvertently.

It is true, as you know better than I, that literally millions of pounds of food are in storage. We would appreciate this committee telling us just what that list is. We can't find out. We are told, for instance, that half of the world's supply of butter is in warehouses' cold storage somewhere in the United States.

I know in your field, Senator, that the current program for wheat farmers, that is in your area, they are encouraged not to grow wheat and at the end of the growing season the Government gives them the equivalent of the wheat they didn't grow from our surplus storage and they sell it.

Senator ANDREWS. In terms of arithmetic, Mr. Mayor, last year the farmers produced 2,800,000,000 bushels of wheat. We consumed in this country 740 million bushels. So, we produced almost four times what our consumption was.

Mayor YOUNG. I could point to a few million people out there who are neglected consumers. That's what I am talking about. We want to explore the extent of consumption and we have requested from THEMA that the list of food for distribution in soup kitchens be expanded. As you know, there is a pretty comprehensive list now but it could be greater.

In response to that request we just received notice that, I think it is canned beef, poultry, and pork have been added to the list of commodities which will be distributed for preparation onsite by soup kitchens.

In addition to that, our city has been certified as a distributor to local food distribution, to food pantries. The food has been expanded to include cornmeal, rice, dried milk, and honey, added to the butter and cheese which, as you know, was already made available.

I think that is a very good thing. I think it is an indication we got some attention from Washington. I believe with your cooperation we can get a hell of a lot more. But the problem has not subsided, as you know.

In the city of Detroit, for instance, it is our estimate that fully 25 percent of the people in our city are undernourished or hungry. One-third of the people in our city—we have a population of 1,200,000—400,000 of those are on some form of Federal relief. Of course, that runs the gamut. That includes unemployment compensation, food stamps, medicaid, medicare, ADC, et cetera.

Senator HOLLINGS. Will you yield, Mayor Young? Do you find now in Detroit the number of people showing up for these food services is on the increase or about the same as it was this time last year, or what is the experience?

Mayor YOUNG. It has increased up to a level now that more people show up than our ability to furnish them with food. Unfortunately, we don't receive enough food to meet the demand.

Senator HOLLINGS. You have to turn some back?

Mayor YOUNG. Yes; that's a problem. I have some figures which I will go over very quickly. I am sure you want those.

With an estimated 12,000 households living without adequate heat, for instance, in Detroit, with an average of 2,300 persons monthly exhausting unemployment benefits, 2,300 monthly exhausting monthly benefits, it is indeed a significant development that THEMA is distributing food, as I indicated to you, although that could still be expanded.

We do not look at these perhaps as possible options, I might point this out, to supplant already existing USDA or Health and Human Services programs. I wouldn't want, for instance, to have the food that we are asking for distribution to supplement the food stamp program. They are two different programs. But, rather, in recognition of the extreme consequence of long economic downturn, the fact that our safety net is indeed in shreds and we have not yet developed an adequate program to address long-term unemployment, we see emergency programs as the only means to preserve some sense of human dignity and assist those who through no fault of their own are faced with an economic crisis.

With all we have done in Detroit in providing emergency food stamps to more than 725,000 people, we are reaching only 35 percent of the needy population monthly. That is our estimate. Our public assistance level as well as our unemployment rate has held steady for the last year. Our unemployment rate, as you know, is in the area of 20 percent. Unless massive and immediate assistance is received from the Federal Government, I cannot predict what human suffering is yet in store for us as we await economic recovery.

Senator, I have a book full of figures here and a report which I hope you will peruse at your leisure.

Senator ANDREWS. I have already had a chance to look at it, Mr. Mayor and it will be filed with the committee. We appreciate your statement.

If I might, I would like now to take out of order Mayor Fulton because of an emergency. He has to leave for the airport as soon as he can.

Congratulations, Dick. An old colleague of mine. He is now chairman of this conference following in the footsteps of Mayor Young.

Mayor FULTON. Senator, Obviously, you are still so young looking, being a Senator is not nearly as tough as being a mayor. [Applause.]

Senator ANDREWS. I notice our hair is getting the same color.

Mayor FULTON. I do appreciate being taken out of order. Unfortunately, I have to return to Nashville this afternoon to attend the funeral of a very close friend in the morning and will return to Denver, of course, tomorrow afternoon.

I do have some prepared remarks.

Senator ANDREWS. Your prepared remarks will be put in the record in their entirety just as though you had uttered every word.[1]

Mayor FULTON. Thank you, sir.

Senator Hollings, it is always a pleasure to see you. I enjoyed your remarks this morning. Give Karen, your very able assistant, my regard when you return.

Senator HOLLINGS. I will do my best.

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD H. FULTON, MAYOR, NASHVILLE, TENN.

Mayor FULTON. Nashville is one of the eight cities that participated in the Conference of Mayors' study entitled "Hunger in American Cities." The survey demonstrated the problem of hunger is on the increase in Nashville as a result of current economic conditions. Rather than recite the statistics at this hearing I would like to take the opportunity to discuss my personal experience and involvement with one aspect of the efforts to relieve hunger, that being the USDA surplus food program.

I became personally involved in the food program last February when an effort in Nashville was made locally to distribute the surplus dairy products, and we did this through the Government Housing Authorities, Public Housing Authorities, being designated as a food bank.

---

[1] See p. 89 for the prepared statement of Mayor Fulton.

This differed from the previous effort in December 1982 when we had our first distribution of surplus cheese and butter. In February the media brought to our attention the fact there was 1.6 million pounds of butter and 3.6 million pounds of cheese that were stored in the Nashville cold storage warehouse.

I contacted the State and Federal USDA officials and was informed it would not be possible to distribute that surplus to local residents because the commodities were earmarked for other States and localities and the paperwork required to mobilize the transfer would mean at least a 60-day delay.

With the help of our Fifth District Congressman, Bill Boner, we jointly pressed Federal officials in Atlanta and Washington, and as a result, surplus commodities were made available, although, ironically, they did not come from the stockpiles in Nashville. They were shipped in specially within a matter of a few days.

In February, April, and May, 105 tons of butter and 105 tons of cheese were requested each month for distribution. We also have our quotas for June and July. Over 813,900 pounds of cheese and 518,000 pounds of butter have been given to more than 140,000 households since December 1982. By the end of July the city government will have distributed more than 2.2 million pounds of dairy products, and this has been the situation in a city that as of this past month has an unemployment rate of only 6.6 percent.

There are people out there who are hungry. Many of them without jobs or on retirement incomes. They are hungry, they need the food, and we feel it is much better to have it distributed on a regular basis than it is to be paying for the cold storage warehouse. We distribute 1 day per month at 48 different sites throughout the city, and this is a 533-square-mile-area city. We have a metro consolidated form of government.

We do this with the help of volunteers from all parts of the community. On one Saturday morning the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the young people 35 and under, had over 100 people that were unloading cheese and distributing the cheese and the butter. It was a great educational process for many of them because they were not aware of the hunger in the city of Nashville.

Also, we use our government departments. We assign one site to the water and sewer division and ask them to take 25 or 30 of their employees that they can spare and assign them to that site from 8 o'clock in the morning to 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

During these days of distribution I try to visit as many of the sites as possible, and it is obvious to me that the lines are longer now than they were in February when we made the first distribution. Often I see in those lines people that I have known since childhood and I know that they have been people who have worked hard when they could have a job. I also see some of the elderly people that have known me since I was a very small boy.

We also have developed a program to send out to the shut-ins through our patrol cars the cheese and butter. And, contrary to what many people think, the people that are in need of these food commodities are not just out there trying to grab something for nothing, because on numerous occasions when the police car arrived and knocked

on the door of the shut-in that had been reported, the shut-in has said, "Oh, I already have mine. I was able to get a ride down to pick it up." If anyone has a lack of confidence in the people of this country, I think that's a good example of how that lack of confidence is not deserved.

As we see the need for assistance grow, we are now in the process of trying to acquire USDA surplus dried food products, commodities such as corn meal, dried milk, rice, and honey. And, again, the metropolitan government, the Housing Authority, has encountered delays and barriers from the USDA. Both State and Federal officials say it will now be September before any dried food commodities can be made available through a similar system as the dairy products.

This, certainly, is frustrating since we have shown the need, we have shown we can successfully distribute the commodities, and further, I think shows we need to modify the system. The number of soup lines, food banks, and surplus distributions in the last 12 months in our city and throughout the country, I think, demonstrates the harsh realities of the problem we are addressing here today.

The local communities become the focal point for the pain of persistent hunger and therefore should be the catalyst for the remedy. I think the USDA, as well as our State distribution, the Agriculture Department, need to listen more to the mayors and to the agencies under the direction of the city governments as to how this food can be best distributed, and done so in a fair and equitable way.

I do appreciate so much the opportunity to appear before you. I know we all are looking for a better working partnership between governments, local, State, and Federal, and I think if that can be developed, it will be developed under the leadership of you two gentlemen who are so gracious to come out to Denver and be a part of our U.S. Conference of Mayors. The Federal Government, I think, can meet the local government's delivery system request, and if we do that we are going to have a lot healthier population, and we are going to have a population that is, indeed, more proud of the country in which they have worked and in which they live.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you, Mayor Fulton, for an excellent statement. Let me add one point. You mentioned and stressed distribution. Of course, that's what we sensed when we first went out to check on these humanitarian feeding areas, the not-for-profit feeding places. The question always was, "We don't have the distribution funds even though we have the commodities." So, now they have $50 million in distribution funds but they are saying they are not finding ways of getting it through. This is what is bothering us.

This morning I was in one of the cheese and butter distribution centers in Denver talking to people there and I found out that in a few weeks they are cutting in half the supplies of cheese. I suspect that's true over the country because they are beginning to get complaints, they claim, from the retail grocers in the areas involved that this cheese comes in conflict with what people would buy. Of course, I got some rather pungent comments from the people in the program, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. Mayor, I ask you what impact on grocers does this distribution of dairy products have in your hometown of Nashville, are you getting complaints?

Mayor FULTON. No; I have not received any complaints nor am I aware of any. I will say that I enjoy going to the grocery store with my wife and I am always amazed that there is always a long line, no matter how many checkout counters they have. It seems they are still doing very well at that cash register, and I don't believe it is legitimate for them to complain about someone receiving 5 pounds of cheese once a month or once every 60 days. I am not going to be overly concerned about that. Their profit and loss statements seem to be looking very good. They keep expanding their locations one after the other.

Senator HOLLINGS. That's good. We really appreciate your presentation.

I wanted to emphasize that point, as Mayor Young was saying, "We don't want that to replace this program"—I should say replace food stamps. Do you find from your experience that the people participating are trying to replace or embellish their food stamp program? I don't want to use the word "cheating" on it, or whatever it is, but that someone would come and say, "Oh, heck, what they are doing, as long as you continue to feed the hungry that way they will take food stamps, they will take it all."

I think this has been, Mayor Young and you all are emphasizing, an emergency kind of program above and beyond the regular food stamp program.

Mayor FULTON. Senator Hollings, as an example I should cite, and will cite, three Sundays ago I had a call from a lady who lives in one of our public housing projects that happens to be in one of the higher crime areas in our city, and she was being harassed by some of the people that live in these projects. She said she could not even leave to go to the grocery store and the only thing that she and her 10-year-old son and 5-year-old son had to eat over Saturday and Sunday was the cheese and butter that they had picked up at the distribution site the previous week.

Fortunately, I was there to answer the phone, and fortunately, I was in a position to pick up the phone and call our police chief and I said, "Look, how about sending the patrol car over to that address and see what can be done."

The patrol car went over and took the mother to the grocery store, and the following day we were able to move that family out of that particular project and into something that was a bit more desirable.

Senator Andrews, you mentioned the reimbursement or assisting the local governments and the cost of the distribution. I am glad you brought that up. I had overlooked it. I was just informed last week that Nashville, even though we will have distributed or have distributed already more cheese and butter than the rest of the entire State of Tennessee, our population is 477,000, the entire State is about 5 million, that we are going to receive the same allotment of those funds that a county received which has a population of, say, 35,000. That's some of the bureaucratic redtape we are up against.

Senator ANDREWS. Who decides that, the State, or is that coming down from the Federal Government?

Mayor FULTON. That is the State that decided that.

Senator HOLLINGS. You can't be a master distributor? I know they have got a master future plan. I thought they would give you more as a master distributor.

Mayor FULTON. I am in an election on August 4, and I am trying not to get involved in those issues of discussion.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you for an excellent statement. Good luck on your trip home.

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Nashville, Tenn., August 16, 1983.

Attention: Denise Alexander.
Hon. JESSE HELMS,
Chairman, U.S. Senate, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HELMS: Enclosed is the response to the eleven questions submitted to this office by your letter of July 27, 1983. It is our understanding that this material will be included in the hearing record.

Although Secretary of Agriculture John Block announced in Nashville earlier this month that U.S.D.A. would make available to states an increased amount of bulk cheddar cheese and increased amounts of processed cheese, non-fat milk, corn meal, honey and butter for household use, we have received no information on how to take advantage of what is available.

We appreciate the work of your committee in the area of Federal food programs. We would like to receive a copy of any recommendations and other pertinent material resulting from your committee's hearings.

With every good wish I am
Sincerely,

RICHARD H. FULTON, *Mayor.*

Enclosure.

Question 1. You indicated that you had sought to distribute cheese and butter stored at a warehouse in Nashville. As I understand it, such warehouses contain commodities which are in forms suitable for bulk storage, such as cans of butter and 40 pound wheels of hard cheddar cheese. In other words, the bulk storage is not suitable for home consumption. Was, and is, Nashville prepared to accept such commodities and convert them to smaller packages at the city's expense?

Answer 1. Nashville has one of the largest butter processing plants in the Southeast and has a cheese processing plant within 125 miles of the city. With the availability of these facilities, we anticipate no problems in converting the dairy commodities to suitable amounts for home consumption. It is our opinion that USDA should convert monies allotted for storage to processing funds and provide it to the cities for a better processing and distribution system. Furthermore, it should be noted that there are considerable problems in the contractual procedures used by Commodity Credit Corp. in processing the food from bulk storage to home consumption. For example, the bids are often in such tremendous volume that it precludes the small dairy industries and similar companies from bidding. In addition, the contracts are usually for thirty, sixty, or ninety days which is insufficient time for a cost efficient operation to be conducted.

Question 2. You indicated that the city "has encountered delays and barriers from the USDA." As I understand it, the city failed to properly apply for available commodities, thus resulting in delays in receipt of commodities. Would you elaborate on what "delays and barriers" existed (or may still exist) that were (or are) caused by the Department of Agriculture?

Answer 2. In December of 1982, Nashville was able to apply directly to USDA for surplus commodities. The results were prompt attention to our request and no delay in receipt of commodities. Since that initial request, we have had to deal with various departments of state government resulting in numerous delays, transportation problems, (truck vs. railroad; pallets vs. no pallets), failure to have orders processed, and most recently a drastic cutback in our allotment. One example is the disparity in contracts permitted by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Other states receive their commodities on pallets at no charge but Tennessee must bear the costs of pallets or do without. The fact that USDA deals directly with the state rather than the recipient city results in increased processing time, communication problems, delays and confusion concerning exact dates for distribution.

Question 3. You indicated that the number of persons benefitting from federal aid programs such as AFDC and food stamps continues to decrease. Nationally, there has been an increase in participation. Would you outline the monthly food stamp participation in Nashville during the past 3–5 years?

Answer 3. The Tennessee Department of Human Services statistics for the persons in Davidson County benefitting from the AFDC and Food Stamp Program are given below:

	AFDC families	Participating food stamp households
June 1981	7,644	23,580
June 1982	6,224	20,102
June 1983	6,402	17,145

The 6,435 food stamp households and the 1,242 AFDC families eliminated from these two programs during the period from June, 1981, to June, 1983, represent a significant decrease in aid to low-income citizens in Davidson County during a time when this nation was in a serious recession.

Question 4. Additionally, what is the food stamp overissuance error rate in Nashville? How many cases (and what percentage of the caseload) were identified as fraudulently participating as a result of an investigation by the Office of Inspector General?

Answer 4. The actual overissuance error rate for Davidson County's Food Stamp Program which is administered by the Tennessee Department of Human Services for the most recent six-month period available (October, 1982, through March, 1983) is ten percent. The ten percent represents 5.3 percent overissuances and 4.7 percent ineligibles. These statistics were taken from the state's quality control sample. Since July 1, 1982, fourteen cases have been identified by the USDA office of Inspector General as fraudulently participating and are being prosecuted. These fourteen cases represent considerably less than one tenth of one percent of the Davidson County Food Stamp caseload.

Question 5. Regarding the special distribution program for surplus commodities, what income criteria or other standards of eligibility have been in effect in your city since the program was initiated in December, 1981, and what are they currently?

Answer 5. The criteria established for eligibility is: (1) persons residing in HUD subsidized public housing, Section 8 housing; (2) AFDC recipients; (3) persons receiving unemployment compensation; (4) food stamp recipients and (5) low-income home bound and handicapped individuals.

Question 6. Do you have any statistics on the income or other characteristics of those who have been served by the commodity distribution program in your city? Do you have any information on what percentage may be also receiving food stamps?

Answer 6. From statistics provided by the Metropolitan Development and Housing Agency, the average income of public housing recipients receiving USDA commodities is $5,077.60. The average household size is 2.7, with 1,978 family heads over 62 and 5,386 unmarried heads of house. No other detailed statistical information is immediately available.

Question 7. Would you outline the amount of surplus commodities that have been distributed in your city during each of the months since the program was first announced in December, 1981? Has the city contributed any money to the distribution effort?

Answer 7. Given below is the monthly distributions that have been conducted in Metro Nashville and Davidson County since December, 1981:

	[1] Cheese	[1] Butter	Agency
March, 1982	38,070	.....	[2] MAC
June, 1982	112,320	.....	[2] MAC
December, 1982	32,700	38,412	MDHA
February, 1983	334,800	20,000	MDHA
March, 1983	.....	112,320	[2] MAC
April, 1983	223,200	230,472	MDHA
May, 1983	223,200	230,472	MDHA
June, 1983	223,200	230,472	MDHA
July, 1983	223,200	230,472	MDHA

[1] Pounds.
[2] State administered distribution.

The city has made significant contributions since employees of the Fire Department, Water & Sewerage, Public Works, Civil Defense, etc., have manned distribution centers in order to provide an efficient and effective operation with no reimbursement from any federal or state source. City vehicles have been used to transport the dairy products to various distribution sites. An exact cost figure has not been determined for all the contributions that the city has made during these distributions.

Question 8. Would you outline what percentage of WIC recipients in your city fall into each of the six priority categories? For example, the first priority in the WIC program covers pregnant women, breastfeeding women, and infants determined to be at nutritional risk by a blood test—or some other documented medical condition.

Answer 8. Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County does not participate in the WIC program. Supplemental food assistance is provided through the Commodity Supplemental Food Program administered by the Metropolitan Health Department. This program serves all women, infants and children who meet the income guidelines established for the program. The present eligible caseload estimate for this program is 11,790. Of this 45 percent are children, 32 percent are infants and 23 percent are women.

Question 9. Aside from the Federal food assistance programs, does the City provide any city-financed food assistance? In what form?

Answer 9. Through the family assistance program administered by Metro Social Services Agency, the Metropolitan Government of Nashville/Davidson County provides $420,000 to be used by low-income residents with a majority of the funds being used for food or grocery orders. Metro government has also provided $60,000 for a nutrition program for the elderly with 23 different congregate meal sites feeding a total of 1,400 persons daily. In addition, Metro provides funding for residential day care programs for children of low-income families and the elderly, and runs a home for the aged and a home for low-income children providing all meals.

The city also operates two hospitals for indigents in which the city provides the prepared meals for all persons hospitalized.

Question 10. Several Mayors seem to suggest support expansion of Federal food assistance programs in time of economic hardship. As the economy improves, do you support a corresponding reduction in these programs?

Answer 10. If and when the economy improves substantially, it will have little or no bearing on the fact that surpluses of dairy products continue to mount causing increased storage expense and possible spoilage. It is my belief that it is better to distribute these products to the needy rather than store them at taxpayers expense at a reported cost of $383 million for this year.

Question 11. Several Mayors stated or seemed to imply that program changes—usually characterized as "reductions"—in Federal feeding programs had contributed to what they perceived to be increased need. What, if any, specific program changes in Federal feeding programs do you believe have contributed to what is perceived as the increasing need for food? Which, if any, of these should be restored?

Answer 11. With increased unemployment rates and higher more rigid standards for eligibility being imposed on federal feeding programs, more people are doing without. To alleviate this, there should be a total review by USDA of these programs with a plan of action to insure that food needs of low income people are met. This study should also determine if it would be advantageous to have a combined food stamp and commodity program made available to insure the nutritional needs of low-income people. Likewise, it should insure the agricultural products produced through the price support programs have a guaranteed storage system.

[The following material was subsequently received for the record:]

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1983.

Hon. CHARLES BOWSHER,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOWSHER: Recently, the Subcommittee on Rural Development, Oversight, and Investigations held a hearing in Denver, Colorado on the subject "Hunger in American Cities."

One of the witnesses was Richard H. Fulton, Mayor of Nashville, Tennessee. He testified about problems he had encountered in obtaining butter and cheese from the Department of Agriculture for distribution in Nashville. As I understand it, the Department contends that proper requests for the commodities were not made.

I understand that members of GAO staff at the Agriculture Department audit site of the Resources, Community and Economic Development Division recently concluded an investigation of these allegations.

I would appreciate receiving for the hearing record by August 15, a brief written description of GAO's findings with regard to commodity distribution in Nashville, including problems associated with either the Department of Agriculture or the city.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

JESSE HELMS, *Chairman.*

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., September 14, 1983.

Subject: Operation of the Department of Agriculture's Special Dairy Distribution Program in Nashville, Tennessee (GAO/RCED–83–239).

Hon. JESSE HELMS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In your letter of July 22, 1983, you asked for a brief written description of the results of our review of the operation of the Department of Agriculture's special dairy distribution program in Nashville, Tennessee. Your letter referred to the Mayor of Nashville's recent testimony before your committee's Subcommittee on Rural Development, Oversight, and Investigations in Denver, Colorado, concerning problems the City of Nashville encountered in obtaining butter and cheese from the Department for distribution to needy individuals. According to your letter, your understanding is that the Department contends that proper requests for the commodities were not made.

The overall objective of our review was to obtain information on Nashville's February 1983 request to the Department's Food and Nutrition Service (the Service), which administers the program, for surplus cheese to be distributed to needy individuals. Our findings are summarized below and are discussed in more detail in the enclosure to this letter.

Subsequent to a newspaper report that large quantities of Government-owned dairy products were stored in local warehouses, the Mayor of Nashville, in a February 7, 1983, letter to the Service's Southeast Regional Office in Atlanta, Georgia, requested surplus butter and cheese for distributions that the city had scheduled for late February. Although the Regional Administrator advised the Mayor in a letter dated February 14 that butter and cheese would be made available to the city (which they subsequently were), prior to that date there was confusion and conflicting information about the availability of uncommitted products in a Nashville warehouse and the length of time it would take to fulfill the Mayor's request. Some of the events and factors contributing to the confusion were:

At the time of the Mayor's request, Nashville was not approved by the Service as a food bank, a prerequisite for ordering dairy products, because Tennessee had chosen to operate a centralized program with only one food bank—the State Planning Agency. On February 14, however, a city agency was designated as a food bank under the program.

Although 35 to 45 days normally elapse between the dates a request is received and the products are delivered, the city had received dairy products in one previous case within about 2 or 3 days. This apparently led some city officials to believe that all requests for dairy products could be filled very quickly.

Service officials in Atlanta were not aware that 372,000 pounds of uncommitted cheese were stored in the Nashville warehouse at the time of the Mayor's request. This occurred because the products were not shown on the Department's inventory listing at the time due to the warehouse's delay in sending the necessary documentation to the Department. As a result, Service regional officials had advised city and State officials that no products were readily available when, in fact, they were.

City officials did not understand why the Department could not fulfill the Mayor's request in a timely manner when it was reported that the local warehouse contained a large amount of surplus cheese. The Department currently requires 35 to 45 days to locate the most appropriate product, considering such factors as the age and location of suitably sized products, and arrange for transporting the products to the requestor.

The result of these events was that, although Nashville received cheese and butter in time for its scheduled February distribution, city officials were concerned about the Department's management of the special distribution program.

Department of Agriculture and City of Nashville officials who provided comments on a draft of our report generally agreed that the report was a fair and objective description of the situation. They did, however, provide some additional information and suggested some changes that have been incorporated into the final report, where appropriate.

Our findings; the objective, scope, and methodology of our review; and Department and city officials' comments on our draft report are discussed in greater detail in the enclosure. We trust that the information provided satisfies your request.

Unless you announce the contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this report until 2 days after its issue date. At that time we will send copies to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Mayor of Nashville. We will also make copies available to others on request.

Sincerely yours,

J. DEXTER PEACH, *Director.*

Enclosure.

[Enclosure I]

INFORMATION ON THE OPERATION OF THE SPECIAL DAIRY PRODUCT DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM IN NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

THE SPECIAL DAIRY PRODUCT DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

The special surplus dairy product distribution program, administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), was initiated in December 1981 to help reduce inventories of Government-owned dairy products and to help feed the Nation's hungry. The surplus dairy products are acquired under the dairy price-support program administered by USDA's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS). The products are stored in warehouses throughout the country.

The special distribution program is a temporary program designed to distribute surplus products to needy individuals at minimum costs and administrative burden. The costs of administering the program have been minimized through the use of volunteers. To be eligible to distribute the surplus products to needy people, a State or local governmental agency or a private organization must be approved by FNS as a food bank. Such approval is to be granted only to food banks a State recommends for approval upon its determination that the food banks have (1) proper storage facilities, (2) adequate recordkeeping systems, and (3) procedures for assuring that the products are provided only to needy persons for household consumption.

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

The overall objective of our review was to obtain information regarding a February 7, 1983, request made by the Mayor of Nashville, Tennessee, to FNS for surplus cheese to be distributed to needy individuals. We made the review in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Our audit work was done between February 22 and April 27, 1983.

We obtained information about Nashville's request for surplus cheese and USDA's response thereto from the city, the State of Tennessee, and USDA. We interviewed officials of FNS headquarters in Alexandria, Virginia; the FNS Southeast Regional Office in Atlanta, Georgia (which has responsibility for FNS programs in Tennessee); the ASCS field office in Kansas City, Missouri (which, among other things, has responsibility for the transportation and storage of USDA commodities); the State of Tennessee; the City of Nashville; and a private cold storage warehouse in Nashville.

NASHVILLE'S REQUEST FOR SURPLUS DAIRY PRODUCTS

On February 7, 1983, a Nashville newspaper reported that millions of pounds of USDA-owned cheese and butter were being stored in warehouses in Nashville and other locations throughout the State awaiting distribution to the needy but that, because of bureaucratic red tape and a lack of money, it could take months or years before the products were made available to the needy. The newspaper said that in the meantime a lot of food could spoil. After reading this newspaper report, the Mayor of Nashville, in a February 7, 1983, letter to the Regional Administrator of FNS' Southeast Region, asked that surplus butter and cheese be made available for distributions that the city had scheduled for February 23 and 24, 1983.

Although the Regional Administrator, in a February 14, 1983, letter to the Mayor, stated that 372,000 pounds of cheese and a lesser amount of butter would be made available to the city, prior to that date there was confusion and conflicting information about the availability of products in a warehouse in Nashville and the length of time it would take to fulfill the Mayor's request. Some of the major events and factors contributing to the confusion were that (1) although the city was not approved as a food bank at the time of the Mayor's request, it had previously obtained surplus dairy products from FNS under the special distribution program, (2) due to the warehouse's delay in sending the necessary documentation to ASCS, there was conflicting information about whether 372,000 pounds of cheese not committed to other purposes were stored in Nashville, and (3) city officials did not understand why the Mayor's request could not be fulfilled in a timely manner with products stored in a Nashville warehouse.

Nashville was not approved as a food bank at the time of the request

At the time of the Mayor's request, Nashville was not an approved food bank, a prerequisite for ordering surplus dairy products from FNS under the special distribution program. Although many States have numerous food banks participating in their programs, Tennessee had chosen to operate a centralized program with only one food bank—the State Planning Office.

City officials' concern about USDA's requirements for ordering surplus dairy products may have been fostered by an earlier experience in which a city agency was able to obtain dairy products directly from FNS on very short notice without following normal FNS procedures. In December 1982 the city's Director of General Services, Metropolitan Development and Housing Agency, requested surplus dairy products from FNS for distribution to public housing residents. FNS provided the products to her agency within 2 or 3 days. Although this distribution was not in accordance with normal FNS procedures because the city agency was not an approved food bank, the success in accomplishing the distribution appears to have led some city officials to believe that additional distributions could be carried out very quickly.

The city agency was designated as a food bank on February 14, 1983, and is now eligible to arrange to receive dairy products from FNS in accordance with the city's own distribution plans.

Confusion existed about availability of dairy products in Nashville warehouse

There was confusion and conflicting information about whether 372,000 pounds of uncommitted surplus cheese, packaged in household-size (5-pound) blocks, were stored in the Nashville warehouse at the time of the Mayor's request. Although FNS regional officials in Atlanta told city and State officials that no uncommitted cheese was available in the Nashville warehouse, 372,000 pounds were stored there that FNS officials were unaware of. The FNS officials were unaware of the uncommitted cheese because, due to a delay in the recordkeeping process, the cheese was not on ASCS' inventory records at the time. (A discussion on why this cheese was not shown on ASCS inventory records at the time begins on p. 4.)

The city's Director of General Services, Metropolitan Development and Housing Agency, who is responsible for managing the city's surplus food distribution effort, told us that State officials advised her shortly after the Mayor's letter was sent to FNS that FNS had advised the State that dairy products stored in the local warehouse were committed for other purposes and that it could take up to 90 days to meet the Mayor's request for surplus dairy products. At this

time the FNS officials were unaware of the 372,000 pounds of uncommitted cheese stored in the Nashville warehouse.

The Regional Administrator, in his February 14 letter to the Mayor, also stated that no cheese was readily available to meet the Mayor's request and said that, at the time of the request, all the cheese stored in the Nashville warehouse was either committed to other purposes or stored in packages too large for distribution to households. The Regional Administrator told the Mayor, however, that FNS was subsequently advised that 372,000 pounds of uncommitted cheese, in transit at the time of the Mayor's request, had arrived at the Nashville warehouse.

The former Chief, Operations and Assistance Section, FNS Special Nutrition Programs, also told us that the 372,000 pounds of cheese were in transit at the time of the Mayor's request. He said that the cheese was shipped to the Nashville warehouse based on anticipated demand and therefore was uncommitted.

Also adding to the confusion, after the Regional Administrator advised the Mayor that the 372,000 pounds of cheese had arrived at the Nashville warehouse, the Mayor contacted the warehouse manager and was told that no such shipment had arrived. The warehouse manager told us that he made this statement to the Mayor because he did not know that three separate shipments of cheese that he had received in January were the shipments USDA intended to give Nashville. (See schedule of arrival dates below.)

USDA officials did not know that the 372,000 pounds of cheese were stored at the Nashville warehouse at the time of the Mayor's request because, due to a delay in the recordkeeping process, the cheese was not shown on ASCS' inventory listing of dairy products stored in warehouses throughout the country until sometime between February 17 and February 27. ASCS, which manages the surplus inventory, uses the inventory listing to decide what products are available for distribution. Products are not entered on the listing until ASCS' Kansas City Field Office receives the shipping receipts from the warehouse. Products being shipped are included on a separate listing. In the case of the 372,000 pounds of cheese, the warehouse delayed sending the shipping receipts to ASCS, and consequently, USDA officials mistakenly told State officials, who in turn told Nashville officials, that no cheese was available from the Nashville warehouse.

The 372,000 pounds of cheese arrived at the Nashville warehouse on 3 different days in January 1983. Shipping documents provided by the warehouse manager and inventory listing dates provided by the Dairy Branch, ASCS Kansas City Field Office, showed that about 3 to 6 weeks elapsed from the time the shipments arrived until they were entered on ASCS' inventory listing. The actual dates are shown below.

Dates cheese arrived at warehouse:	Dates cheese shown on ASCS inventory	Days elapsed	Quantity of cheese shipped (pounds)
Jan. 12	Feb. 22	42	111,600
Jan. 14	Feb. 22	40	111,600
Jan. 25	Feb. 17/18	24/25	148,800
Total			372,000

One of the reasons it took as long as 3 to 6 weeks for the cheese to be entered on ASCS' inventory listing was that, according to the warehouse manager, the warehouse took longer than usual to send the warehouse receipts to ASCS. He said that although it usually takes warehouse employees about 2 or 3 days to send the receipts to ASCS, in the case of the three January shipments, it took about 2 weeks because of a staffing shortage.

City officials did not understand why Mayor's request could not be fulfilled as quickly as they desired

City officials did not understand why FNS initially said that it could not meet the Mayor's request in a timely manner, particularly since products reportedly were stored in a local warehouse.

At the time of the Mayor's request, USDA required a minimum of 60 days from the time it received a request until the product was delivered. This requirement

was subsequently revised to 35 to 45 days. According to the Regional Director, Special Nutrition Programs, FNS Southeast Region, and other USDA officials, the lead time of 35 to 45 days is needed so that USDA can locate the most appropriate product to fill the order, considering such factors as the age and location of products, and contract with a transportation firm to ensure that deliveries coincide with the local entities' distribution plans.

The Regional Administrator, in his February 14 letter to the Mayor, also discussed the matter of lead time, saying that FNS procedures call for orders to be placed 45 days prior to the month of planned distribution so that the product can be located and transportation arranged to ensure arrival in accordance with local distribution plans. He said that without an assured delivery date, local plans could be negated, resulting in a waste of volunteer services and confusion on the part of the intended recipients.

According to the former Chief, Operations and Assistance Section, Special Nutrition Programs, the fact that USDA-owned products are stored within a State or city does not necessarily mean that the products can or will be used for the special distribution program within that State or city. According to USDA officials most of the cheese USDA stores is in barrels or blocks too large for distribution to individuals. Consequently, the bulk cheese must be transported for processing before it can be distributed. Also, the USDA officials said that some cheese may be unsuitable for household distribution because of its age or condition. These officials explained that the older cheese is donated to institutions under other programs because institutions are considered to be better able than individuals to safely handle any cheese that may have deteriorated slightly.

One question raised by city officials was why a local government entity cannot deal directly with FNS in arranging for products to distribute, thereby eliminating the time required to go through the State. According to the former Chief, Operations and Assistance Section, Special Nutrition Programs, under program procedures, each State consolidates the requests it receives for surplus dairy products from the various local entities approved to distribute food (food banks) within the State and submits one consolidated order to FNS. He said that if FNS had to deal directly with each local entity, FNS' workload would increase greatly and the distribution system would operate less efficiently.

AGENCY AND CITY COMMENTS AND OUR EVALUATION

The Director, Food Distribution Division, FNS headquarters, and the former Chief, Operations and Assistance Section, FNS Special Nutrition Programs, who provided comments on a draft of our report for the Department, said that the report was a fair and objective description of USDA's handling of the Nashville request, but added clarification on two issues.

First, although we said that city officials did not clearly understand the program's procedural requirements, FNS officials had explained the procedures to the city's Director of General Services, Metropolitan Development and Housing Agency, in December 1982 and advised her to apply for food bank status.[1] Second, FNS officials kept State officials fully apprised of FNS' actions in response to Nashville's December 1982 and February 1983 requests because, in accordance with FNS' agreement with the State, Nashville's requests should have been made through the State.[2]

The FNS officials also said that, despite the problem caused by the warehouse's delay in submitting shipping receipts, ASCS' requirement that products not be entered on its inventory listing until the shipping receipts are received is in keeping with sound inventory management practices.

The Director, General Services, Metropolitan Development and Housing Agency, who provided comments on a draft of this report for the City of Nashville, said that, overall, the report accurately described the circumstances involving Nashville's request. She said, however, that contrary to what we had said in the draft report, she knew what FNS' procedures were at the time of the Mayor's February request but believed that there were problems that could have been avoided. (See footnote 1.) She said, for example, that although she had sent

[1] The statement made in our draft report that city officials did not fully understand the program's procedural requirements was deleted based on comments made by agency and city officials.

[2] Our report was revised to reflect State officials' involvement in Nashville's dairy product distributions.

a letter to the State in December 1982 asking that the State designate the Metropolitan Development and Housing Agency as a food bank, the State had not acted on her request until after the Mayor's February request to FNS. She said that, in her opinion, the program's administration could be improved, particularly the time required to fill orders, if major cities were allowed to deal directly with FNS in obtaining surplus products for distribution.

Senator ANDREWS. Our next witness is Hernan Padilla, mayor of San Juan, chairman of the Advisory Committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, Mayor Padilla.[1]

STATEMENT OF HON. HERNAN PADILLA, MAYOR, SAN JUAN, P.R.

Mayor PADILLA. Mr. Chairman and fellow colleagues, it is indeed a rare privilege to participate in such a distinguished panel to discuss a topic which has, unfortunately, become of increasing importance to our Nation's cities, that of providing food assistance to economically disadvantaged people.

USDA programs have served as one of the major resources for providing much needed assistance to the poor of Puerto Rico, especially since the Commonwealth is excluded from participation in many of the other Federal assistance programs such as general revenue sharing and supplemental security income or has restrictive limitations on participation in other programs such as medicaid and aid for families with dependent children. It is important to remember that even with a large number of disadvantaged residents participating in the food assistance program, Federal spending in Puerto Rico is far less than half of the national average. Because the situation in Puerto Rico differs to a great extent from those in the various States, let me begin by providing some background and a brief description of our programs as they currently operate.

Puerto Rico has participated in the Federal food stamp program only since 1974, approximately 10 years after the program began for U.S. citizens residing on the mainland. During that 10-year period, Puerto Rico had a commodity food distribution program, operated at a level of approximately $45 million. In the early 1970's, the food stamp legislation was rewritten to, in essence, order all communities having commodity distribution programs to convert to food stamps. Overnight, in Puerto Rico, the program became a household word and the beginning of the program in Puerto Rico in 1974 has had an obvious and dramatic effect in combating hunger and, in some cases, malnutrition.

I have alluded earlier to the fact that U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico are denied certain mainland welfare programs. The fact that these programs count as income for purposes of the food stamp program resulted in the fact that a very high level of our population—at one time 56 percent of our approximately 3.2 million citizens—were receiving the benefits of the food stamp program. I mention this because the high level of participation must be weighed against the factors of certain welfare programs—aid for families with dependent children and supplemental security income—which Puerto Ricans do not receive. I consider this a double standard and unfair application, and suggest that treating U.S. citizens who are poor and reside in Puerto

[1] As of press release Mayor Padilla's responses to written questions from Senator Helms had not been received.

Rico in a different manner than the poor in the U.S. mainland is a regressive and unjust application of Federal programs. We have heard the standard argument that Puerto Ricans do not pay Federal taxes, and I would counter with the suggestion that less affluent individuals generally do not pay Federal taxes in the U.S. mainland.

The food stamp program continued in Puerto Rico until passage of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 which had a negative effect, due to one exclusive provision related specifically to Puerto Rico. The law did the following:

It took Puerto Rico out of the Federal food stamp program, and reduced the benefits to a fixed level of funding, at $825 million, for 3 consecutive years.

It allowed the island to come up with some alternative to food stamps, and USDA regulations allowed a cash out of benefits.

In addition to freezing the funding level, the amount provided represented a 25-percent cut from the funding level expected under the Federal food stamp program for fiscal year 1982. This, in turn, forced a 10-percent reduction in the number of participants in the current program. Recognizing the large proportion of residents requiring such assistance—nearly 500,000 families were eligible for assistance as of July 1, 1981, many with no income at all—increased flexibility was provided by Congress to allow Puerto Rico to design the most effective distribution system possible.

With USDA approval, the Government of Puerto Rico replaced food coupons with monthly checks mailed directly to the heads of qualifying households beginning in July 1982. The benefits of such a program include: Substantial savings in program administration, enhancement of the dignity of the recipients, and reduction of fraud. Any problems feared concerning the temptation to spend such funds on nonessential items have proven to be minimal, a fact which was supported in a program analysis prepared by USDA's food and nutrition service at the request of Congress and published in March of this year.

Yet in spite of that, last summer Congress approved an admendment to require that some type of food stamp-oriented currency be reinstituted. This action took place less than a month after the new program had begun and before any analysis of its impact was available. Under this requirement, a new distribution system must be developed and in place by October of this year. Although we are exploring various alternatives, in the event this amendment is not repealed, it is our hope that Congress will reject this earlier decision and allow the program to continue at least for one more year until further analysis is made. The House Agriculture Committee will soon be in Puerto Rico for hearings on the food stamp issue and will focus attention on the operations of Puerto Rico's nutrition assistance program. It is our hope that these hearings will lead to a reversal of last summer's amendment.

We are aware of the concerns expressed by some of the retailers in Puerto Rico. We need to provide additional mechanisms to insure that these funds will be used only to purchase necessary food, meeting the nutritional needs of the residents of Puerto Rico. I would urge that

additional time be provided to allow us to explore possible remedies to the program as it currently operates. Once again, I stress that the program has only been in operation for less than a year and that is hardly enough time to adequately study its long-term effects. I would hope that Congress can provide us with this much needed and merited extension.

Another aspect of the block grant initiative was the allowance of 4 percent of the appropriated funds to be directed to agricultural stimulus projects to increase food supplies and lower prices. Three projects have been approved by USDA which include: An expansion of existing projects for production and processing of garden and starchy vegetables, pork, eggs, fish and shrimp, as well as milk sterilization; a tick eradication project for cattle and to protect our dairy industry; and a comprehensive education and outreach project to include such topics as family budget planning, meal preparation, and nutritional information. All of the projects are worthwhile and will have a significant impact on our agricultural sector. Approximately $20 million of the block grant funds will be used for such projects to be matched by another $20 million by the Puerto Rican Government.

In addition to these projects which have already received USDA approval, it is my hope that a portion of the funds available be used for the establishment of an economic development-related jobs initiative in Puerto Rico. The use of Federal funds for this activity is warranted as such an effort would lead to a reduction of recipients from our food assistance rolls and would provide those individuals who are qualified and able with an opportunity to work while enabling us to undertake additional economic development activities. Such an approach could eventually provide those individuals with skills that would lead to self-sufficiency and self-employment. In the long term small business development could also be increased. The advantages of such a program for all concerned are endless and the individual development possible is immeasurable.

The distribution of surplus commodities has been successful in Puerto Rico, with an effort being made to utilize those commodities that are best suited to the Puerto Rican diet such as surplus rice. Although the recent jobs stimulus bill provided an emergency food provision, a more extensive long-range plan to free up surplus commodities for food assistance is needed. Legislation has been introduced in both Houses of Congress to institute such a long-range approach.

We appreciate your committee's efforts in considering and reporting out the Domestic Commodity Distribution and Food Assistance Act—S. 17—and realize that the measure is now on the Senate calendar awaiting floor action. We are anxious that full Senate consideration begin as soon as possible as such efforts would utilize existing surplus resources and will produce immediate effects nationwide. This is indeed one route that Congress cannot afford to overlook, at least until we see a reduction in the demand for such assistance. Although there are questions still to be resolved concerning the provision of administrative funds to churches and nonprofit organizations to cover storage and distribution costs of such a program, I would urge that Congress come to an agreement and move ahead with such efforts as soon as possible.

I agree with the argument that such funds need to be provided to the organizations responsible for the distribution of the designated commodities. This assistance would accelerate the process and increase its efficiency and cost effectiveness. A possible approach would be to designate a percentage of funds provided to localities to cover such administrative costs. Furthermore, the establishment of a match requirement for the areas receiving such assistance would insure that there is a strong commitment at the local level to become involved in this program.

In closing, as a mayor of a large city and as a physician, I applaud your efforts in recognizing the severity of the problem confronting us at the local level and the efforts which have already been made by Congress to oppose any reduction in food assistance funding levels for fiscal year 1984 and would further urge that such a commitment to the Nation's hungry be maintained throughout the process of setting our Nation's budget priorities.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

What recommendations would you make to improve the use and distribution of surplus commodities in San Juan?

Mayor PADILLA. I think we are using the right ones. They have selected one, the Social Services Department, and the amount of commodities we have received is not large enough to create a stoppage. I think they are doing it the right way. They are using the people who qualify for the food stamp program, the ones that are identified, then these same people are moved to certain centers where they get the commodities.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor.

Our final witness on the first panel is the Honorable Arthur Holland, mayor of Trenton.

Mr. Mayor, good to have you here. We look forward to your testimony. Let me assure you your statement will appear in the record in totality as though you have uttered every word. So, if you want to summarize it and be available for questions, that might be of interest to you.[1]

STATEMENT OF HON. ARTHUR J. HOLLAND, MAYOR, TRENTON, N.J.

Mayor HOLLAND. I will do that. My thought after I got here was that I would read you verbatim two of the responses I got from people from whom I asked information in preparation for this presentation. I asked three people, the director of our Department of Health and Human Services; the executive director of our war on poverty, CAP agency, United Progress, Inc., he is also a city councilman; and the executive director of the Trenton Ecumenical Area Ministry, the federation of clergymen and women to whom I look increasingly for help in the private sector in meeting the needs that have become worse as the Federal and State governments have cut back on the traditional

[1] See p. 92 for the prepared statement of Mayor Holland.

programs. One comes through as kind of bad news and the other a good news response.

[The following material was received by the committee:]

CITY OF TRENTON, N.J.,
June 1, 1983.

To: Albert M. "Bo" Robinson, Councilman.
From: Arthur J. Holland, Mayor.

I have been asked by the U.S. Conference of Mayors to testify before a congressional committee on how the surplus commodities program is working in Trenton and I shall appreciate receiving any comments you may have on our experience with the U.S. Department of Agriculture Programs.

———.

P.S. I need by Friday.

DEAR MAYOR HOLLAND, In response to your request for comments on the surplus commodities program and its effect in Trenton, I am happy to say that the effect has been favorable. Given the current economic situation, which has been regarded as permanent by many of the poor, the issues of butter and cheese which have occurred several times in the past year have been welcomed by the recipients. One must see and talk to these people, who suddenly see the government as giving them something. One must hear mothers talk of the many dishes they can prepare with cheese; omelets, potatoes, etc. One must experience hearing a mother remark that this butter will allow her to fix food without using lard or grease remaining from other dishes. A cake suddenly becomes a real treat.

The surplus program has done much to make needy Americans aware that they have not been totally forgotten, and that some of the excess remains here for our consumption instead of being shipped to far off lands or even to be dumped in the ocean. Let us have more of these commodities, so that those living on some form of assistance and on low income can have some of the things that can make life a little better.

DRAFT

JUNE 10, 1983.

ARTHUR J. HOLLAND,
Mayor, City of Trenton, N.J.

The following data is provided per your request for information on the increase of the incidence of hunger in Trenton and information on the school lunch and food stamp program.

Information on the incidence of hunger, according to the World Hunger Education Service, can only be estimated by analyzing data from a variety of sources. One of the most reliable sources is the number of residents below poverty level. Without direct assistance, persons in this economic category would almost certainly face hunger situations. Another indicator would be the number of persons assisted by emergency food programs, which was forwarded to Mr. Mercatanti yesterday.

NATHANIEL E. COBB,
Director, Department of Health and Human Services.

Mayor HOLLAND. The director of our Department of Health and Human Resources supplied the statistics which are included in my presentation.

I would like to speak to the matter much more informally, as mayors can do. Any mayor who moves around the community can tell you which funeral director is doing the most business, whether chicken or roast beef is running more expensively on the market, tell you whether a hotel is the center of activity, as it should be. Most importantly, he can tell you what it is like out there by the number of people who come to his office, the calls he gets, the number of people

he sees on the street, just drifting homelessly. People come into the office asking just for money, or a place to stay at night.

Most importantly, they are looking for work, which, of course, would solve the other problems, at least alleviate them.

The Welfare Bureau in Trenton announced for the first time in 60 years, that is how long they have been in business, they have been having to say no. The Rescue Mission, which is about that age, which never depended on any kind of government help, was about to go out of business until it was saved by the jobs bill. If this had not occurred I don't know what we would have done because that is the place we usually send people who have no place to stay at night.

You would have to, I suppose, be a mayor of an old central city, as many of those at the conference are, to appreciate fully the situation, when you realize in a city of almost 100,000 people, almost every fourth person is in a one-parent situation, which means aid for dependent children, you have up to 18 percent of the population who are senior citizens, and you rely on real estate revenue still heavily in our State, and thus, we are not a developing community, it is essential that Federal and State aid, or one or the other not be cut. During this time of decline in the economy it is vital we receive the assistance we need to meet the very basic needs of society, food, shelter, and clothing.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, for an excellent statement. You mentioned churches and the voluntary organizations in Trenton and the work they are doing. Do you feel that these churches and similar organizations can continue to maintain the pace of their service in this particular area?

Mayor HOLLAND. Well, remarkably, the United Way witnessed, in the face of the declining economy, a significant increase in giving across the country. In the same way the churches and other nonprofit organizations have responded to the challenge. But I am afraid it is going to be more difficult to institutionalize that than it is the Federal and State programs because the enthusiasm that is generated at the beginning of such a program is hard to sustain sometimes, and ironically the soup kitchen, which is in our central business district, is cutting into the sales of the merchants on our Commons, because we become a magnet now in our area for those who are in real need and those who have the money with which to shop are fearful, for example. In the interest of doing good we are also perhaps cutting into the potential for business of those without whose taxes we can't continue to help, at least governmentally.

Senator ANDREWS. Let me ask one other question, Mayor. They have been talking about hunger and feeding programs more and more for the last decade or so. Do you think the problem is getting more serious? Is there a greater need there today than there was 5 years ago?

Mayor HOLLAND. It is hard to tell nationally, of course, without looking at the results of the studies to which Mayor Young referred. At least in the Northeast the central cities are becoming increasingly, because of exclusionary zoning, because of lack of tax reform, the clustering places for the disadvantaged. We have a disproportionate number. I would not be able to really answer that question in a generic way.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you very much, those of you on the first panel. It has been a privilege to have you.

My special thanks to you, Mayor Young, as president of the Conference of Mayors, for the great coordination and help that your staff has been to our staff, and to you personally for the great hospitality you have shown me in the 2 days I have been out here in Denver.

[Questions submitted to Mayor Arthur J. Holland of Trenton, N.J., by Senator Jesse Helms, and answers thereto:]

Question 1. What specific "Federal funding cuts" do you believe "have" adversely affected the Trenton Public Schools Nutrition Program and the WIC Program"? What regard to the school lunch program, would you provide the number of students participating in each of the three income categories, and the amount of Federal assistance received for each such category during the past 3–5 years? What has been the city's contribution to this program?

Answer 1. The major federal funding cut which has adversely affected the Trenton Public Schools Nutrition Program was the elimination of reimbursement for extra free milk and for milk consumed by children who bring their own lunches.

The WIC Program, as a result of federal funding cuts, instituted a waiting list and at the beginning of fiscal year '83 (November-December 1982 and part of January 1983), a total caseload freeze was mandated by the State whereby every potential new participant and participants due for recertification were placed on a waiting list by priority and received no WIC benefits, regardless of nutritional risk.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM DATA—STUDENTS ELIGIBLE BY INCOME CATEGORY

	Free	Reduced	Paid
1980–81	10,147	426	2,908
1981–82	9,582	716	3,988
1982–83	9,910	585	3,996
SCHOOL LUNCHES SERVED BY INCOME CATEGORY			
1981–82	1,600,238	36,158	45,630
1982–83	1,582,040	45,861	51,595
FEDERAL ASSISTANCE RECEIVED BY INCOME CATEGORY			
1981–82	$1,968,076.25	$38,066.15	$6,739.41
1982–83	2,036,085.89	34,265.54	8,410.02

Note: The City does not contribute to this program.

Question 2. You indicated that "Food Stamp allocations fall far short of feeding a family" and that such families "especially at the end of the month, seek food assistance" from non-profit organizations. Do you have any specific data to support your contention that families are running out of food stamp benefits at the end of the month? Also, what evidence do you have to support your contention that the cause for such occurrences, if they exist, is because food stamp benefits "fall far short" of providing for the family? Have you assessed other possible causes such as uneconomic food selections, or poor budgetary or meal planning for the month?

Answer 2a. Many families in the Trenton Area are running out of food stamps at the end of the month. The number of persons requesting emergency food assistance at United Progress, Inc. has increased by 28 percent since 1982. This increase is seen despite the fact that UPI closed its community centers in 1981 due to budget cuts. Prior to the closing of these centers, the second leading problem reported by clients visiting UPI's community centers was lack of food.

Other agencies are also seeing large numbers of individuals in food crises. The Trenton Area Soup Kitchen, Inc. presently serves up to 300 individuals daily in the two hours it is open.

According to the directors of the Food and Nutrition Program and the community centers operated by United Progress, Inc., families are running out of food stamps by the end of the month for a number of reasons. While some people believe that uneconomic food selection and poor budgetary and/or meal planning are the causes, experienced staff believe families are simply not receiving enough food stamps. UPI's Food and Nutrition Coordinator provides budgetary and meal counseling to families with problems. She is a former caseworker and Income Maintenance Technician with Mercer County Welfare. Despite her wealth of experience with budget and meal planning, she reports that there is not much she can do to stretch the clients' food stamp benefits, because "they are simply not getting enough food stamps". The UPI community center directors agree with this observation based on client contacts. The center directors also note that some families, albeit a small percentage, are forced to sell some of their food stamps to help pay their rent, electric, gas and heating bills.

Answer 2b. Two agencies that provide emergency food assistance to Trenton families provided information to support my contention that families are running out of food stamps benefits at the end of the month.

Mt. Carmel Guild provided emergency food assistance to 491 clients, representing 1,372 family members in June and July 1983. The most frequent reason given on the intake form was that the food stamps had not lasted. It was noted that requests for food assistance are particularly heavy during the last two weeks of each month.

The Forum Project distributed food equivalent to 6,507 meals between June 15 and July 31, 1983. An estimated 90 percent of persons requesting assistance have run out of food stamps.

It is certainly possible that uneconomic food selections or poor budgeting or meal planning may be contributing factors for food stamp benefits falling far short of providing for the family. However, the reliance of many families on inner city Mom and Pop stores for food purchases would contribute to uneconomic food selection as much as the family's own food selection habits.

Also, as a direct result of reduced federal levels of appropriation, the mandate to distribute food planning information in conjunction with food stamp benefits has been removed.

Question 3. Regarding the special distribution program for surplus commodities, what income criteria or other standards of eligibility have been in effect in your city since the program was initiated in December, 1981 and what are they currently?

Answer 3. The eligibility requirements for participants in the Commodities Distribution Program was decided by Governor Kean's Task Force on Commodities.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPANTS

To be eligible to receive cheese, a person must be identified as needy by meeting one of the following criteria.

1. Participate in one of these programs:
   Aid to Families With Dependent Children, (AFDC).
   The Food Stamp Program, (FSP).
   Pharmaceutical Assistance for the Aged, (PAA).
   Supplemental Security Income, (SSI).
   Women's, Infants and Children, (WIC).

Participants in this program must show some form of program identification to automatically receive their cheese. Program participants who are not able to show proof of their program enrollment must then show other proof of income and complete a commodity request form.

2. Have a family income which does not exceed 185 percent poverty, (see guidelines below). These persons must complete a commodity request form on which they attest to their income as well as show some proof of income level, such as an unemployment or Social Security check or pay stub.

Important: Individuals may not receive cheese from more than one distribution site.

Effective July 1, 1982–June 30, 1983 (48 States, District of Columbia, Territories Excluding Guam):

FNS Income Guideline for reduced price lunches, (185 percent annual)

Family size:	
1	8,660
2	11,510
3	14,360
4	17,210
5	20,055
6	22,900
7	25,750
8	28,600
Each additional member, add	2,850

(Information taken from Federal Register, May 28, 1982, vol. 47, No. 104.)

Question 4. Do you have any statistics on the income or other characteristics of those who have been served by the commodity distribution program in your city? Do you have any information on what percentage may also be receiving food stamps?

Answer 4. All families served by our commodity distribution program met the income eligibility guidelines established by Governor Kean's Task Force on Commodities, (see three above). Our program has served over 21,000 families to date. Information has not yet been compiled on the number of these families who may also be receiving food stamps. UPI used a pre-registration system for the commodity distribution. All necessary information is on file for each recipient of commodities, (see commodities distribution report)

Question 5. Would you outline the amount of surplus commodities that have been distributed in your city during each of the months since the program was first announced in December, 1981? Has the city contributed any money to the distribution effort?

Answer 5. Commodity Distribution, LEAD agency: United Progress, Inc.

1. Cheese Distribution, (2,240 cases), (67,200 lbs.):
   a. Registration—Sept. 16–19, 1983.
   b. Distribution—Oct. 4–8, 1983.
2. Cheese Distribution, (additional allotment from Bayonne, N.J.) (200 cases), (6,000 lbs.):
   a. Distribution—Oct. 21–22, 1982.
3. Cheese Distribution, (2,229 cases), (66,870 lbs.):
   a. No Registration—Used computer print-out.
   b. Distribution—Nov. 4–5, 1982.
4. Butter Distribution, (2,134 cases), (76,824 lbs.):
   a. Registration—Feb. 1–9, 1983.
   b. Registration—Feb. 9–14, 1983.
   c. Distribution—Feb. 17, 1983.
5. Cheese Distribution, (2,240 cases), (67,200 lbs.):
   a. Registration—Mar. 28–31, 1983.
   b. Distribution—Apr. 14, 1983.
6. Cheese Distribution, (additional allotment from Phillipsburg, N.J., 200 cases, 6,000 lbs.):
   a. Registration—Mar. 28–31, 1983.
   b. Distribution—Apr. 23, 1983.

Lead Agency: American Red Cross, Distributing Agency: UPI.

1. Cheese Distribution—Feb. 23, 1983.
2. Cheese Distribution—Mar. 3, 1983.

A total of 290,094 lbs. of cheese and butter were distributed by United Progress, Inc.

Question 6. Would you outline what percentage of WIC recipients in your city fall into each of the six priority categories? For example, the first priority in the WIC program covers pregnant women, breastfeeding women, and infants determined to be at nutritional risk by a blood test—or some other documented medical condition.

Answer 6.

TRENTON WIC PROGRAM

Priority	Percentage of recipients [1]	Nutritional risk code [2]	Explanation
I	12	W: 01–18. I: 01–05, 15, 16.	Pregnant women, breastfeeding women and infants in nutritional need as demonstrated by blood test or growth measurements or other documented medical conditions which demonstrate the person's need for supplemental foods.
II	3	I: 06, 14, 17, 18, 14–20.	Infants (up to 6 mo. of age) of WIC recipients during pregnancy, except for infants which qualify for priority I. Also, infants of mothers whose medical record documents that they were at risk during pregnancy due to nutritional conditions detected by anthropotric or biochemical data or other nutritionally related medical conditions.
III	19	C: 01–05	Children in nutritional need as demonstrated by blood test or growth measurements or other documented medical condition which demonstrate the child's need for supplemental foods.
IV	20	W: 19–32, 34. I: 07–13, 19, 20, 22.	Pregnant women, breastfeeding women and infants in nutritional need because of an inadequate dietary pattern, as documented by a qualified professional.
V	44	C: 07–13, 20, 22	Children in nutritional need because of an inadequate dietary pattern as documented by a qualified professional.
VI	2	W: 01–34	Postpartum women in nutritional need.

[1] Data November 1982 to January 1983.
[2] Exceptions noted by competent professional.

Question 7. Aside from the Federal food assistance programs, does the City provide any city-financed food assistance? In what form?

Answer 7. The City's Division of Welfare issues emergency vouchers for food and checks on an emergency basis for food and shelter to persons receiving general assistance. The City contributes 25 percent towards the general assistance program. In 1982, 42 emergency vouchers for food and 132 checks on an emergency basis for food and shelter were issued.

Question 8. Several Mayors stated or seemed to imply that program changes—usually characerized as "reductions"—in Federal feeding programs had contributed to what they perceived to be increased need. What, if any, specific program changes in Federal feeding programs do you believe have contributed to what is perceived as the increasing need for food? Which, if any, of these should be restored?

Answer 8a. According to the coordinator of the Food and Nutrition Program at United Progress, Inc., (UPI), Food Stamp Program changes have contributed to the increased need for food. When the program was established, it required a purchase requirement which was determined by the client's net income after shelter and medical expenses were considered. The client always paid some cash toward the purchase of food stamps. The change eliminated the purchase requirement and made eligibility requirements tougher. The new program changes were geared toward reducing food stamp participation enough so the program would be eliminated in 1985. The income eligibility was decreased, making it much harder to be eligible for the program, and laws were revised to make some household members eligible and some ineligible. Strikers are now ineligible, and college students' parents must be eligible in order for the student to be eligible. Federal aid given by other federal programs may be counted as income in determining eligibility. People who are eligible for the program after meeting the new requirements are now getting less food stamps than before. All of these changes have contributed to the increased need for food.

Answer 8b. Changes in the Federal school lunch eligibility guidelines requiring families to be at 175 percent rather than 195 percent of the poverty level and the increase of the reduced price lunch from $.20 to $.40 have contributed to an increasing need for food and should be rescinded.

I also recommend that the federal government reinstate the mandated distribution of food planning information with food stamp benefits and provide the necessary appropriations. Another federal program change which I recommend for restoration is reimbursement for stolen food stamps.

Question 9. You stated that "tighter standards have eliminated many families from the Food Stamp Program." Nationally, there has been an increase in participation. How many people in your city (and what percentage) participate in the food stamp program? What has been the monthly participation in the program over the last 3 years?

Answer 9. In 1982, 10,653 households, representing 32.8 percent of all Trenton households, participated in the food stamp program. (See following chart.)

HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS—TRENTON

	1980	1981	1982	1983
January	11,677	11,719	10,946	10,848
February	11,715	12,082	10,911	10,764
March	11,701	12,247	10,841	10,495
April	11,663	12,156	10,614	10,627
May	11,700	11,915	10,400	10,402
June	11,719	11,934	11,424	.....
July	11,825	12,054	10,524	.....
August	11,677	12,047	10,532	.....
September	11,729	11,991	10,533	.....
October	11,932	11,787	10,702	.....
November	11,749	11,284	10,601	.....
December	11,972	11,138	10,808	.....

Source: Mercer County Board of Social Services. Data represents 85 percent of Mercer County households receiving food stamps.

Senator ANDREWS. We will call up the next panel of our mayors: Mayor Morial, Mayor Feinstein, Mayor Barry, and Mayor Wessman. We will take a stretch for a couple of minutes.

RECESS

Senator ANDREWS. The subcommittee will resume.

At this point let me place in the record a statement by Senator Gary Hart, in whose home territory we are holding these hearings.[1] He asked to submit it for the record.

Our next witness will be the Honorable Ernest Morial, mayor of New Orleans, chairman of the Health, Education, Employment and Human Services Committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Mayor Morial, good to have you here. We are looking forward to hearing your testimony. As I have informed your colleagues, your prepared remarks will be included in full as though given word for word. You can summarize in any way you might see fit.[2]

STATEMENT OF HON. ERNEST N. MORIAL, MAYOR, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mayor MORIAL. Thank you very much, Senator Andrews. First allow me to express my deep thanks and appreciation for your presence here today. I am sure I express the view of the Conference of Mayors in thanking you for allowing us to present our concerns to you about a major item on our national agenda.

[1] See p. 86 for the prepared statement of Senator Hart.
[2] See p. 93 for the prepared statement of Mayor Morial, see also, p. 120 for written questions from Senator Helms and Mayor Morial's answers thereto.

I think it is unnecessary for us to engage in any flowery remarks or rhetoric but simply to address some of the facts that are important to this issue facing the Nation, an issue in which the U.S. Conference of Mayors is vitally involved and deeply concerned.

I would like to point out the service assistance conditions in my city of New Orleans, for example, which has a population of approximately 500,000 people and a median income of about $15,000. In my city requests for emergency food assistance have increased about 200 percent over the last year, and that demand has become such that it is impossible for us to meet it.

Private agencies are reporting dramatic increases in food demand. Our food bank served 8,500 clients in 1981, but experienced a 67-percent increase in the number of clients requesting aid in 1982. By the end of 1983 our food bank expects to have served 21,000 clients, almost triple the demand of 1981.

The Salvation Army in the city of New Orleans has had a 40-percent increase in demand for its emergency food program. Soup kitchens in my city reported a 20-percent service increase.

According to a survey which was conducted by our community services office this year, the three main reasons for this service demand increase are local unemployment, an increase in unemployed transients coming to the city of New Orleans from other U.S. cities, emigrating Haitians and Cubans who are now resettling in our city, and cutbacks in Federal food assistance programs.

You know as well as I do that our Nation continues to experience a much higher than anticipated rate of unemployment while we continue to cut programs that benefit America's poor and unemployed. Our estimates indicate that every 1 percent increase in unemployment adds 1.23 million people to the food stamp program.

In my city unemployment continues to increase and now approaches approximately 11 percent. Employment in my city being dependent to a large extent upon a depressed energy industry, our economic slump is going to last perhaps longer than the national slump. Yet, our food stamp allocation has decreased to the point where we are forced to cut back service to the 1978 levels.

Under such circumstances we pose the question as to how the appointed custodians of our national agenda can justify a Federal policy which chooses to ignore completely those who lose out in the workings of our free enterprise system as a result of the high unemployment rates that face the Nation. I don't think that we can forget those victims.

Budget cuts inflicted upon food stamps, medicaid, women, infants and children, and AFDC, in my opinion have gone too far. I think we are eliminating the basis of support that the Federal Government in urban areas built during the last decade for the low-income citizens.

I urge you to listen to the remarks of my fellow mayors, as I know you have done thus far, and remember when we speak of hunger the cities are the places where the buck really stops because that is where we find most of the people in need of food assistance. Our people bear the brunt of program cuts that abandon the disadvantaged, and I

don't think that our urban needs could or should be excluded from our national agenda.

Thank you.

Senator ANDREWS. Mayor Morial, let me ask a little different question. It is one that intrigues me. What might be the benefits to the city of New Orleands if hunger, for all practical purposes, was eliminated, what difference would that make in the running of the city?

Mayor MORIAL. Well, Senator Andrews, I think hunger has such a devastating impact upon the total quality of life, it causes such a great deal of hopelessness, and places great strains upon health care and health delivery systems, that a variety and a wide range of social ills would be severely reduced, in my opinion, if we were able to eliminate the degree of hunger which we presently face in my city.

Senator ANDREWS. So, the presence of adequate food where it is now inadequate would pay back many dollars return for each dollar invested in savings and a host of other areas where the city must participate?

Mayor MORIAL. Certainly, I think, in addition to that, it might encourage some of those who have become disenchanted and are hovering on the edge of hopelessness and the brink of despair to have renewed enthusiasm about engaging in other productive pursuits.

Senator ANDREWS. You state, and I was intrigued with your statement, Mr. Mayor, you state New Orleans has the second highest infant mortality rate in the Nation—higher than Jamaica or Angola, as a matter of fact. Do you have any evidence that the lack of food, inadequate nutrition, might contribute to this unfortunate circumstance?

Mayor MORIAL. The inadequacy of proper nutrition for pregnant women certainly has some bearing upon the conditions of birth.

Senator ANDREWS. You are finding that in New Orleans there simply isn't enough WIC program funding to adequately nourish pregnant women?

Mayor MORIAL. That is correct.

Senator ANDREWS. That, of course, causes, as Senator Hollings pointed out, these brain cells that are formed during gestation to not form in the proper way and we end up spending $5 or $10 later on for each dollar we don't spend now.

What might be the effect on New Orleans if general nutrition assistance block grants would be enacted into law by Congress?

Mayor MORIAL. We think that would certainly address the present condition and would be of inestimable assistance to us in addressing some of the problems we face in that area if cities are guaranteed input in their statewide distribution.

Senator ANDREWS. Are you getting an adequate supply of surplus products in New Orleans?

Mayor MORIAL. No; we are not, largely because of the method of distribution, but I think in recent months that has been improved upon.

Senator ANDREWS. You have no problems in your internal distribution in New Orleans?

Mayor MORIAL. No.

Senator ANDREWS. It is getting it to you in a serviceable way.

Thank you very much, Mayor. It is a privilege to have you here.

The next witness is Mayor Dianne Feinstein, mayor of San Francisco. Welcome to our committee. Good to see you here.

STATEMENT OF HON. DIANNE FEINSTEIN, MAYOR, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mayor FEINSTEIN. Thank you. Delighted to be here. I am particularly pleased that you brought your committee to the Conference of Mayors.[1]

Let me tell you a little bit about our city. It is a little different than some of the others, in some ways very much the same. We are a city of about 705,000 people, with a relatively low unemployment rate, 8 percent, strong retail sales, good economy, upward mobility, a corporate and service headquarters city, and yet we are a city that is 50 percent nonwhite, about one-third of the population elderly, and with an average income, strangely enough, the lowest of the nine Bay Area counties. That means we have a lot of poor people in San Francisco.

It is true, I think ,when you talk about hunger, as many of us in this room probably look at it as the pangs you get when mealtime approaches. In this country I don't believe you can count hunger by the distended bellies of youngsters, but you can count hunger today in a number of different ways. In our city you can count them by the increasing number of men in three-piece suits, believe it or not, standing in food lines, women with briefcases standing in food lines, the elderly standing in food lines, the indigent standing in food lines, joined by the traditional food-line standards of those who have substantive use problems, and most notably alcoholics. You can also count them by the increasing number of people foraging in garbage piles throughout the city. That is something I have never seen in my 49 years of life in the city and town of San Francisco, and I must say to you it is something I don't like to see.

You are talking here today, hopefully, about the Federal policy and I would like to talk on a few impacts that, I believe, Federal policy has had on my city. One is the impact of the policy which has deleted some 600,000 people from the social security rolls. It is estimated that 14 percent of San Francisco's homeless and hungry population is directly related to this Federal policy change. So, if you would ask me, it is a bad Federal policy change.

Second, very often Federal assistance is too little too late and not enough when it comes, and I want to speak to that. Last winter we had our major problem, November, December, January, and February, a lot of homeless, a lot of hungry. Winter months, no place to go. What we received from Washington then was a press release promising help. Finally, in May, far beyond our critical period we got the promise of help that was far less than our need.

Our share of the $50 million from the jobs bill is a grand total of $261,000 for food which will go to the United Way. But even that won't be here until August, and then it must be spent by September 30. Now, you can ask the question, what do you do the other 10 months of the year?

---

[1] See p. 94 for the prepared statement of Mayor Feinstein.

I am going to tell you what we have done, but before that I want to give you a second example of a breakdown in Federal policy. That is the dairy foods distribution program that so many of my colleagues have referred to. In San Francisco last March the Agriculture Department gave us 750,000 pounds of cheddar cheese. That was 20 truckloads of about 39,000 pounds per truck. It was eagerly received at 27 sites throughout our city. We saw evidence of demand in areas where there was never demand before, solid residential areas where seniors came out in droves for their precious bits of cheese.

But the very next month, and reportedly in response to the lobbying against the distribution by grocery chains, the Agriculture Department cut the entire State of California to 750,000 pounds of cheese. That was the same amount the month before it gave to the city of San Francisco alone.

The food commodities program, which is currently distributing through nonprofit agencies in San Francisco, has been turning people away since October of last year. There is clearly a need across this land to increase these programs, and you yourself eloquently made the case when you pointed out earlier that we only utilize one-third of our wheat production. And I think that the result of what many of us would consider a Federal infidelity is that our city and others have been going it alone.

What does it mean when you go it alone, because we have done that and we are a city with a budget surplus, a city that has been able to increase virtually every area of city service in the past few years. What it means is that we absorb the hunger burden for those who cannot. In San Francisco daily today we feed 2,400 men, women, and children, every day, and we do that without any Federal assistance. This has meant 325,000 meals in the last 6 months.

We also provide emergency shelter for an average of 1,200 men, women, and children night after night after night. We have found a bed 154,000 times for a person or family in the last 6 months.

Now, this costs us about $200,000 a month of our local tax moneys, and additionally, we have started our own jobs program, which some people have said, "Ho, ho, your homeless people aren't really going to work, you'll see." Absolutely the opposite is the case. We started it with 100 people. Not one of them has dropped out. We use three city departments, Parks and Recreation, the Municipal Railway, and the Department of Public Works. Everyone is getting a superior job rating, and the belief is that everyone of them is employable. We intend to continue it and hopefully be able to use some of the Federal jobs money. What has this meant?

Now, the State of Washington and the State of Oregon directly to the north of California have no general assistance programs. So, what it means is that we are seeing increasing numbers of people who find out about cities where they can get some help coming to those cities. That isn't fair, either, because you can't continue to carry the burden for yourself and for others, and I think that that is something, frankly, that the Congress has to grapple with, to equalize the burden across this Nation.

You mentioned something, a general assistance block grant, and the thought has occurred to me that if we had some kind of emergency

trigger, either a GA grant which would reward those who also already provide, or even in our community development block grant that is measured by unemployment. I don't mind in a city of 8 percent unemployment, if a city of 20 percent unemployment gets more. I think that is only fair and just and right.

I think you must work to establish those criteria for aid, those eligibility standards, if you will, that are set by the economy of the city, the unemployment rate, the buying power, the welfare rolls, and so on, and I believe that these grants must be carefully controlled so that they don't set community against community.

What we are finding with the job moneys in San Francisco and the public hearings that HUD mandates, is that those existing programs strapped to the bones come in and there is a dog-eat-dog competition in the public hearing, of one group against the other, white groups, Asian groups, Hispanic groups, to see who gets more money. That is exactly the wrong kind of competition to set into motion.

It is my view that we have some recovery, but that recovery has been on the upper levels of corporate business America, that it has not trickled down to the worker. The unemployment rate mentions that, and I think slap-dash instant cups of soup don't solve the problem, that the Congress really has to look at unemployment and say, "All right, it is going to be with us for a while." So, this business of sending a small amount which arrives too late, there is a fight over where it goes, really doesn't make very good sense, that you have got to gear yourselves for a program that must continue and not change policies every year, not be dependent on one bill but is going to be able to continue with consistency so that we can develop the administrative standards on the local level.

There is another thing, one last point. Poverty, homeless, hunger, varies from city to city to city. I couldn't tell Mayor Morial what his problems are or Mayor Barry what his problems are or Mayor Wessman what his problems are, but I sure as heck know what my problems are, and I really believe that the mayors of the cities are the ones who best know how that money should be utilized. We don't want any waste. We want the programs to be cost efficient. We want the dollar to go farther and we want it to reach the people in our communities most needy. I mean there are programs, "you can't give this dollar to the elderly, you have got to give it to the youngsters. You can't give this dollar to the youngsters, you have got to give it to the elderly." Let us put the money where it best goes based on the criteria that you set. That is really what I urge and request.

Senator ANDREWS. That is, Mayor, why we accepted your invitation to come out and hold the hearings right here, because you are the elected leaders of the cities throughout our country. Getting firsthand information from you and placing it in the record could give us some very specific information to use with the Department of Agriculture. and, of course, the other appropriate committees as they try to write these perhaps so they are more responsive, so we heed your plea not to change techniques, not to change ways of doing it unless there is a substantial and necessary reason for that change.

Mayor Feinstein, would you care to elaborate on your written statement that the Department of Agriculture is too responsive to the

politics in the food situation? You may not have been in the room when I asked Mayor Fulton from Nashville. He stated, they were not.

Mayor FEINSTEIN. I would have to reinforce what I said. My people tell me this is true in California, and witness, 1 month you have 750,000 pounds of cheese to deliver to San Francisco, the next month that is all that is delivered to the entire State.

Senator ANDREWS. You didn't say that you had noticed this kind of complaint. Now, we listen to this claim from the Department of Agriculture and from other agencies year after year. I have been privileged to sit in Congress now for two decades and I have heard it from Republican and Democratic administrations. It doesn't sound all that good coming from either one. But we have to make this government work. When it comes right down to the city, have your grocer friends come to you and said, "Mayor, you know this distribution program is bothering us"?

Mayor FEINSTEIN. To me directly, no. But let me get you a substantiation for the comment, which I will be pleased to do.

Senator ANDREWS. I know where the comment is coming from because I have been hearing it from the Department of Agriculture, but I have yet to have anybody come in to me and say, "This is wrong." I have yet to have my corner grocer say, "Hey, we don't want this distribution of commodities."

Mayor FEINSTEIN. So, what you are saying, it is a convenient excuse?

Senator ANDREWS. I don't know, but they are listening to a different drummer.

Another question: What Federal policy changes would assist in helping the hungry in your city the most?

Mayor FEINSTEIN. I think the major Federal policy change that would help us the most is the consistent and ongoing grant of funds from which we could devise those programs for the needy based on the needs in San Francisco, not in New Orleans or Washington, D.C., but in San Francisco. So, local flexibility to an amount of money that we can plan on and know it is going to be there.

If I could just take this opportunity, you asked one of my colleagues whether he thought the churches could continue to provide beds and services. We had a very active program. It began with 10 of them. We found that you can't sustain over a long period of time, that there are problems that come from beds close together on church floors, from screening of applicants, from people who are ill who need medicare. And so we have gone through an intensive program of screening people and putting them on general assistance to make up that slack, and then providing an amount of money in addition to general assistance for those who don't qualify, and in hotels that are run like the Salvation Army, St. Anthony's, organizations that traditionally cope with the homeless and know how to do it.

Senator ANDREWS. Mayor Morial mentioned how the cutbacks in these distributions were going to leave him short in some commodities. Are you getting adequate commodities in San Francisco from the Department of Agriculture? Could you use in your food and feeding programs more flour, more pasta products, more of these other surplus commodities than you are getting?

Mayor FEINSTEIN. Absolutely. I agree with what Mayor Holland had to say. Butter is nice and no one is going to turn it down, but bread,

meat, vegetables, canned goods, I think those are far more worthy items.

Senator ANDREWS. Where I got started on it, when I went down to the church in Washington on 16th Street and found that they were doing their best with what they could find. They were darned good foragers and they were taking care of the people in that area, but they didn't have one pound of support from the Federal Government, and I come from a farm area that is wondering what to do with our wheat and what to do with our other commodities, and our pinto beans and the rest are going begging because there is no market. We could give some surplus commodities. It is a national problem and it is one that is definitely there. That's why your remarks have been so helpful.

[Questions submitted to Mayor Dianne Feinstein of San Francisco, Calif., by Senator Jesse Helms, and answers thereto:]

Question 1. You outlined six programs which you described as "San Francisco's attack on hunger." However, four of these are actually Federal programs—school breakfast, school lunch, summer food service and commodity supplement food program. Does the city contribute any funds to these programs other than the Federal contribution?

Answer 1. No.

Question 2. You seem to indicate opposition to the requirement that a percentage of all applications for free lunches be verified. As you may know, a report by the Office of Inspector General several years ago found that income may be underreported in one-third of all such applications. How do you believe that this provision of law adversely affects the hungry poor?

Answer 2. The possibility of having to undergo verification of income will serve as a barrier to parents applying for reduced or free breakfast and lunch for their children. Many parents are proud and consider the income declaration and verification to be an invasion of privacy. These parents perceive the income process as being tantamont to begging for food.

In addition, the administrative cost of providing staff to verify income is prohibitive, exceeds the cost-saving, and is not reimbursable by the federal government.

Question 3a. Does the WIC program operate in the same areas that CSFP operates?

Answer 3a. Yes.

Remainder of question 3. What is the difference in eligibility for commodity distribution versus WIC participation? What is the relative size of the CSFP program compared to the WIC program in San Francisco? Has the city considered consolidation of the programs, in order to reduce administrative expenses and insure that more dollars will actually go to providing food assistance?

Answer to remainder of question 3. The difference in eligibility for the W.I.C. program and the Commodity Distribution Program is that the WIC Program participation is determined by health guidelines (e.g., pregnant women and children at medical or dietary risk) and eligibility criteria for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program is determined by guidelines designating low income. Participants in the WIC Program are children up to the age of 5 and mothers up to 6 weeks postdelivery. In San Francisco the population served in the WIC program is 6000 and in the Commodity Supplemental Program 7500, for a total service population of 13,500.

The question of whether to consolidate these two programs has been debated over recent years without resolution. Given that the programs emphasize employing former clients to serve as staff, consolidation would result in laying off these workers. Since the workers are primarily single parents, many would no doubt have to resort to public assistance for maintenance.

To the question of consolidation, I might also add that the State of California W.I.C. program has identified approximately 20,000 persons in San Francisco who are eligible for participation in WIC and the Commodities Supplemental Food Program. San Francisco is presently only allowed to serve a combined total of 13,500 clients. We need to expand the programs to include all of the 20,000 persons in the service population.

Question 4. Regarding the special distribution program for surplus commodities, what income criteria or other standards of eligibility have been in effect in your city since the program was initiated in December, 1981, and what are they currently?

Answer 4. Prior to July, 1983, the income criteria was based on a self-declaratory statement. Since July, 1983, the program has been transferred to the Department of Education, Office of Surplus Property, and this agency provides guidance in determining income eligibility.

Question 5. Do you have any statistics on the income or other characteristics of those who have been served by the commodity distribution program in your city? Do you have any information on what percentage may be also receiving food stamps?

Answer 5. As noted in answer No. 4, we utilized the selfdeclaratory statement of low-income eligibility prior to July, 1983, and hence have no statistics on income. The vast majority of persons served were residents of low-income or Economic Opportunity Council designated Catchment areas. We have no information on the number or percentage of clients served who may have also received food stamps. However, based on the fact that the population served were either linked to the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (A.F.D.C.) Program or unemployed, we can assume that a sizeable number of those served also received food stamps to maintain a minimal level of subsistence.

Question 6. Would you outline the amount of surplus commodities that have been distributed in your city during each of the months since the program was first announced in December, 1981? Has the city contributed any money to the distribution effort?

Answer 6. The San Francisco Food Bank has distributed approximately 2 million pounds of commodities since December 1981. The Economic Opportunity Council has distributed 26,016 pounds of non-fat milk, 308,512 pounds of butter, 376,800 pounds of processed cheese and 32,000 pounds of cheddar cheese, for a total of 743,328 pounds of commodities. In April, 1983, my office distributed 793,600 pounds of cheese under the Mass Dairy Distribution Project.

Question 7. With regard to the school lunch program, would you provide the number of students participating in each of the three income categories, and the amount of Federal assistance received for each such category during the past 3–5 years? What has been the city's contribution to this program?

Answer 7. The meals and federal assistance for the school lunch and breakfast programs for fiscal years 1980–81, 1981–82 and 1982–83 are as follows:

1980–81

Lunch—4,982,848 meals served at a federal cost of $4,826,647.

Breakfast—2,208,982 meals served at a federal cost of $1,376,977.

1981–82

Lunch—4,463,721 meals served at a federal cost of $4,587,924.

Breakfast—2,032,054 meals served at a federal cost of $1,368,894.

1982–83

Lunch—4,493,703 meals served at a federal cost of $4,838,337.

Breakfast—1,960,239 meals served at a federal cost of $1,391,227.

Of those numbers approximately 82 percent receive free lunch, 10 percent reduced rate and 8 percent full pay.

In fiscal year ending June 30, 1982, the federal subsidy per meal was $1.04 for free lunches, 64¢ for reduced lunches and 13¢ for paid lunches.

In that same period, the federal subsidy was 64¢ for free meals, 33¢ for reduced meals and 9¢ for paid breakfast meals.

Question 8. Would you outline what percentage of WIC recipients in your city fall into each of the six priority categories? For example, the first priority in the WIC program covers pregnant women, breast-feeding women, and infants determined to be at nutritional risk by a blood test—or some other documented medical condition.

Answer 8. Prior to April 1, 1983, the WIC Program served 3000 participants. Of that number 83 percent were priority 1, 10 percent were priority 2 and 7 percent were priority 3. During that period only the first three priority categories could be served.

After April 1, 1983, the WIC Program received approval to increase the service population to 6,000, thereby allowing service to be rendered to the priority 4 category. To date, approval has not been granted to allow services to priority categories 5 and 6. San Francisco needs to have the allotment of service popula-

tion increased to serve a greater number of the 20,000 eligible persons who are in need of this essential service.

Question 9. Aside from the Federal food assistance programs, does the City provide any city-financed food assistance? In what form?

Answer 9. Yes. There are two program areas of city funding for food assistance. Under provisions of the city's General Assistance Program, meals are provided under contract three time per day, per applicant for the first two weeks of aid. This in-kind contribution cost the city approximately $900,000 in fiscal year 1982–83. In addition, under provisions for the homeless population of the city, an additional $750,000 was expended, on a contractual basis, for food and shelter. Included in the shelter program is the availability of two meals per day, per client. Comparable amounts have been budgeted for fiscal year 1983–84.

Question 10. How many people in your city (and what percentage) participate in the food stamp program? What has been the monthly participation in the program over the last years?

Answer 10. According to the State Department of Finance publication of May 1, 1983, entitled "Population Estimates of California Cities and Counties," San Francisco's population is 646,600. Based on that figure, the average number of food stamp participants for 1982–83 was 50,997 or 7.34 percent. The high for that period was 7.46 percent in March 1983, and 7.26 percent in July and December of 1982. For that same fiscal year, the number of persons certified to the food stamp program was 52,026, or 7.49 percent of the population.

Question 11. With regard to the food stamp program in your city, do you utilize photo identification of prevent fraud? (Answer: No.) Have you used wage matches to detect unreported income and fraudulent participation? (Answer: Yes.) What is the overissuance error rate in your city?

Answer 11. In the period from April 1982, to March 1983, the average number of duplicate Authorization to Purchase (A.T.P.s) issued on a monthly average was 125. The total duplicate A.T.P.s issued for that period were 1,504 out of a total monthly average of 24,921 certified households.

Question 12. Several Mayors seem to suggest support expansion of Federal food assistance programs in time of economic hardship. As the economy improves, do you support a corresponding reduction in these programs?

Answer 12. No. Residents in San Francisco who are experiencing an economic hardship have been in this condition over a long period of time and have only recently been identified based on the nationwide focus on the homeless. Not only is this population unemployed but also suffers from some form of disability either due to mental deficiencies or substance abuse. Moreover, for most of this population, former jobs are non-existent due to advances in technology which have eliminated their jobs. San Francisco is attempting to meet some of those needs through the establishment of a jobs program for retraining. Our initial effort is limited to 100 persons at an initial cost of approximately $300,000. Economic recovery rarely trickles down to this category of citizen whose lives so desperately need restructuring.

Question 13. Several Mayors stated or seemed to imply that program changes—usually characterized as "reductions"—in Federal feeding programs had contributed to what they perceived to be increased need. What, if any, specific program changes in Federal feeding programs do you believe have contributed to what is perceived as the increasing need for food? Which, if any, of these should be restored?

Answer 13. As you are no doubt aware, the United States Department of Agriculture has reduced by 50 percent NATIONWIDE its distribution of dairy commodities since April, 1983. Some sources attribute this reduction to effective lobbying from the grocery industry while others attribute the reduction to a lack of ability on the part of USDA to have the commodities processed. Whatever the case, the real need is the same. People in need of the comodities no longer receive the resources on which they have become dependent. The level of distribution should be increased to previous amounts and the additional food items (rice, flour, corn meal, etc.) should be made available on a more widespread basis. In addition, the percentage of allowable administrative cost should be increased from 5 percent to at least 10 percent. This increase would enable existing authorized agencies with an established record in commodity distribution to expand their programs to assist agencies and churches serving the homeless to meet their needs.

In San Francisco, we observe the increasing need for food commodities by the ever-growing long lines at our congregate feeding sites. Social Service agencies have continued to complain that they cannot keep pace with the demand of their clientele. We need to establish additional congregate feeding sites. However, the criteria of 6 months operation prohibits most potential sites from participation.

Finally, we need an extension of the Jobs Bill and its provisions for emergency food programs.

Senator ANDREWS. Our next witness on this panel, of course, is the mayor that we all hear about while we are in Washington, D.C. Good to have you here, Mayor Barry. We are looking forward to hearing from you.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARION BARRY, JR., MAYOR, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mayor BARRY. Thank you very much, Senator Andrews. I certainly would like to congratulate you and certainly thank you for deciding to come to the Conference of Mayors and to have this hearing on this very important subject.[1]

Let me just say for those outside of the District of Columbia and some inside, there is a view that maybe Washington, D.C., is the home of the Federal Government and the Congress and a lot of lobbyists and a lot of rich lawyers and we don't have any problems there. But let me just take the opportunity to describe our great city.

I would also like to thank you for making the decision to live in the District of Columbia, so you are technically, for a moment, a constituent of mine. If you could vote for me it would be awful nice.

Senator ANDREWS. Mr. Mayor, I think that might get me into a little difficulty.

Mayor BARRY. Second, since the District of Columbia doesn't have the right to select our own Senators, as you very well know, and our Congress person, you are my Senator, too. So, I am your Mayor and you are my Senator, so we have a mutual concern.

Seriously, the District of Columbia has approximately 700,000 residents who live in the District of Columbia. Our last month's unemployment rate officially was 10.3, among black males almost 17 percent, among black teenagers some 45 percent. We have 120,000 people on the medicaid program, 95,000 people in our food stamp program, and approximately 9,000 people who are on aid to dependent children. So, the District of Columbia is suffering from the same kind of pressure and the same kind of problems that other cities, in fact to a large extent, are suffering. We in the District of Columbia are bearing a disproportionate share of the poverty of the region.

As you very well know, we are a Federal city, on the one hand; we are a local city in terms of local programs, and my administration is trying to meet some of these needs.

I would like to just summarize part of what I am going to say. My fellow mayors have done a very good job outlining the problems. But the frustration I bear is a little extra in the sense that I see and hear the needs and the great deliberation that goes on in the Congress, in

[1] See p. 96 for the prepared statement of Mayor Barry.

both Senate and House, and I hear the statements from the President and other national leaders. I see Cabinet members who debate the great subjects of the day. I see firsthand the discussion on MX missiles and the B–1 bomber at a cost of $60 billion. That adds to the frustration because actually when on the other hand I go to that same church you went to on 16th and Newton and see how those persons are trying to make——

Senator ANDREWS. A fantastic job.

Mayor BARRY [continuing]. Trying to make a way out of no way, and when I see long lines of young men, not old men, men under 30 who are there, when I go to Blair and Pierre School where we house some 250 people each night, that causes me double frustration. I know Dianne and Dutch and Mayor Wessman may be frustrated, but I get doubly frustrated because I can see all the contrasts right there.

In our region there are over 250,000 men, women, and children who at any time could face a foodless situation. These are persons who have an income of less than 125 percent of the basic poverty level, therefore could find themselves totally without money to purchasee food in view of the enormous cost of living in Washington.

Our food stamp program last year grew by 3,158 individuals over the last previous year, despite cutbacks in entitlement eligibility. We further anticipate this will continue to grow in 1984 to in excess of 95,000 individuals. This, of course, demonstrates the need for greater food stamp efficiency.

However, I would like to mention another problem not brought up here. That is, there is an assumption that food stamps in itself is enough to adequately feed people. We find that there are people who are able to qualify for food stamps who still find them inadequate to meet monthly food requirements.

One group of persons that are particularly hard hit by this problem is the elderly poor. In Washington they number some 14,000. We have a contradiction: As social security benefits increase, the eligibility in terms of the amount of food stamps decreases. So, you have a situation where you are getting more on the one hand and getting less on the other hand.

So, these people are suffering and they cost us money and cost the city money, and our own money. The District of Columbia Government is feeding almost 3,000 seniors each day a full-range lunch at some 64 different feeding places.

We also have a community food bank which began operation in April 1980, and again we can see the growth. It started serving about 5,000 or 10,000 individuals each month. Approximately six-member agencies. Currently the food bank is supplying food to approximately 80,000 individuals each month through 250-member organizations. In the last 3 years of operation the bank has supplied nearly 3½ million pounds of food.

This food primarily comes from grocery stores and others, cans that are bent or in some other way on the market and they give it in bulk to the food bank. It is good food.

Let me also indicate, Mr. Chairman, a survey taken by the Food Research and Action Council of food banks and pantries around the country revealed that there are four groups of people most affected by

the inadequacies and inequities of the food stamp program: Those who run out of food stamps at the end of the month, those who use the food banks during the month to stretch their food stamp benefits, those who are experiencing delays in processing food stamp applications, or delays in when food stamps arrive, and those with assets who can't qualify for food stamps.

There is a significant number of people who are in a Catch-22 situation. They don't earn enough money to adequately meet their own needs by themselves but yet they earn too much to qualify for the food stamp program. Of course, there has to be some eligibility requirements, and you are going to have that same problem. But the unfortunate people are the ones who are suffering the most, poor people.

As we look at our food distribution program, you find that through the Council of Churches, and there are 80 member organizations, we have distributed over 2 million pounds of cheese and butter since January 1983 to needy persons throughout the District. Such distributions have served as many as 18,000 persons at any one time.

There is the WIC program. Again, we see over 10,000 mothers, infants, and children each month. This is increasing every month by approximately 200 people over last year, again demonstrating a need, demonstrating the problem.

Let me just speak to the problem of food and infant mortality. When I came in office in 1979 I made the reduction in infant mortality the high priority of my administration. I established a blue ribbon task force on infant mortality, bringing in the nutritionists, gynecologists, hospital administrators, public health administration, health workers, a whole range of persons to look at the whole question of infant mortality.

When we came in office the rate was 28 per 1,000. That meant for every 1,000, 28 persons died the first year. We are happy to announce about 1½ months ago we had dropped that to 20 per 1,000. Not enough but a great and significant increase, lowest ever in the history of the District of Columbia.

One of the most important factors that we found, which contributed to the infant mortality was nutrition, the lack of adequate diet, adequate food, not only after the mother becomes pregnant, we found that trend started with those bodies some 3, 4, and 5 years before the pregnancy.

We also found that particularly among teenagers who have babies, basically, that was even more acute. I have visited our own city hospital and I have seen those low birth rate babies, and you go around the corner to those healthy 5 and 6 and 7 pound ones, and Senator, another corresponding problem here, it costs approximately $100,000 to get those low birth rate babies up to normal size. Again, nutrition and food has been seen as a very, very important factor. Of course, alcohol and drugs and other abuses add to it, but the lack of adequate diet does that.

Then our school lunch program has been cut, as you well know; 85 percent of all the children of the District of Columbia who ate lunches participated at a reduced price or free. Even though the Federal Government cut back, we decided not to do so and we are spending

$11 million of our own local tax money to operate the program at the level it was the year before. Again, we believe that every child ought to be able to go to school and have an adequate breakfast and a good lunch so he or she can use that energy to learn and develop their abilities.

So, Mr. Chairman, the District of Columbia is unique. On the one hand, it is the home of over 700,000 citizens who call it our home, it is the seat of the Federal Government, it is an international capital of the world, but yet with all of this, right down the street you find hungry people in our Nation's capital and other cities around the country.

So, it seems to me this is the time of the year to try to bring to bear your influence. It is my sincere hope that you will exercise your influence as a member of the Senate Budget Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Agriculture Committee to urge your colleagues to insure that the matter of hunger in America will be a high priority in the budget-making process.

Also let me say the matter of hunger is not simply a problem that takes place on the holidays, it doesn't take place just on Thanksgiving or at Christmas or Easter or New Year's. It is a 365-day affair and 366 during leap year, for some people.

I often tell the story, which is basically the truth, and I think we have all experienced it. I run out of the house one morning and forget to take a couple of dollars in my shirt pocket, I get to my office and I want to get a cup of coffee or get a sandwich and I reach in my pocket, my shirt pocket, and I don't have a nickel, and for about 45 seconds I get traumatized. I start looking and reaching around and trying to find some money. I know I have good credit with my executive assistant and the citizens of the District of Columbia pay me well, so I have little money. But can you imagine the trauma and the emotional feeling of a person who doesn't know where that nickel is coming from, that dollar is coming from to buy food or to have a job?

That is the issue we are facing, Mr. Chairman. Hopefully, with this record being made, that your colleagues in the Senate and in the House of Representatives can see what some of us feel and see every day. And finally, Mr. Chairman, these are not conventional figures, these numbers are not made up, this is not rhetoric when Dutch talks about New Orleans and Mayor Feinstein talks about San Francisco and Mayor Wessman talks about Twin Falls. It is serious business. We ought to take it seriously.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you, Mayor Barry. You have been very helpful.

One final question, Mayor Barry: Do you know if commodities are being distributed more effectively now than they were a few months ago?

Mayor BARRY. I get the impression they are. As you know, Mr. Chairman, we have had to call upon volunteers and use some city money to get the food out. We have more centers now. We started with a smaller number. Unfortunately, part of our difficulties started in the winter, in January when it was cold, people couldn't move around as rapidly. We still have long lines. These are primarily churches and these are lines

outside the church auditorium, waiting to get inside, from the outside, and once people get their food they leave and others take their places. So we still need more food and we need more distribution centers.

Senator ANDREWS. But the distribution of commodities for the nonprofit feeding centers is improving since we put the $50 million in?

Mayor BARRY. I think we received about $890,000 out of that. It will help, but again, we need different kinds of food and we need some administrative help. Without that, that is a short-term program. After September that's gone, you have to go back to the nonprofit sector.

Let me say in reference to St. Stephens. It represents a voluntarism that I have encouraged in Washington. But, again, they are making a way out of no way. They are doing it with glue and band-aids and anything else they can find to keep the program together. They also have contributions from a more wealthy Episcopalian diocese, foods that they bring over to St. Stephens.

Again, I don't think the nonprofit community church can continue to carry this tremendous burden. I think they have done a fantastic job under the circumstances and they are carrying out their Christian commitment. But, again, it costs them money, too, to get it done. So we need more food, more money for the administration and distribution of it. it seems to me, and need a broader range.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me say another aspect of this program. It affects hunger in the sense young people now are the victims of the advertisers of this country, television sets and radio, including my own. I have a 3-year-old son and I try to keep him from watching some of the nonsense on television.

Again, we need more of a nutrition educational program in our elementary and high schools so people can begin to learn what real good nutritional food is and the food that is bad for the body. We need to get them started early and get these young ladies in nutritional education way before they are ready to think about having children.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you very much, Mayor Barry.

[Questions submitted to Mayor Marion Barry, Jr., of the District of Columbia, by Senator Jesse Helms, and answers thereto:]

Question 1. You stated that "We find that there are people who are able to qualify for food stamps who still find them inadequate to meet monthly food requirements". Do you have any specific information on this issue? In particular, have you assessed whether the cause is actually insufficient benefits, as you imply, or other possible reasons such as uneconomic food selections, or poor budgetary or meal planning for the month?

Answer 1. The reasons why persons run out of food stamps before the end of the month do vary but the primary cause is clearly the insufficiency of the benefits. In a survey conducted in 1974 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics it was revealed that food stamp recipients compared to non-recipients spent the same percentages of their income on wholesome but less expensive food. A later survey conducted in 1976 by the USDA confirmed this claim.

While it is clear that food stamp recipients on the whole make prudent food selections it is difficult to budget well when the cost of even less expensive foods is steadily increasing. With present benefit levels too low to purchase even the thrifty food plan, the fact that insufficient benefits preclude one's purchases lasting the entire month is obvious.

Additionally, food requirements vary from household to household while the allotment remains constant. The food requirements of a family with growing children are greater than those of a sedentary adult. A recent study conducted by an independent research organization of 160 non-profit agencies nationwide operating food programs revealed that 75 percent of the agencies serve more

families with children than they did one year ago. These agencies also reported that a significant proportion of the people who they serve are food stamp recipients whose benefits have run out by the third week in the month.

Finally, food stamp allotments do not take into consideration regional differences in food costs or the availability of certain types of food. In the District where the cost of living is high, it is more expensive to make food purchases than in areas with a lower cost of living.

Question 2. Does the WIC program operate in the same areas that the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) operates? What is the difference in eligibility for CSFP versus WIC participation? What is the relative size of the CSFP program compared to the WIC program in Washington? Has the city considered consolidation of the programs, in order to reduce administrative expenses and insure that more dollars will actually go to providing food assistance?

Answer 2. The Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) and Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) both operate throughout the District, serving in areas that have been identified as having a need for both programs. CSFP has operated in the District for over ten years. In FY 1981 the WIC program was implemented as an initiative to reduce infant mortality and to provide options for residents whose needs the CSFP Program did not address, i.e., high-risk problems requiring special food packages. The availability of both WIC and CSFP provides options to both the potentially eligible population and to health professionals for meeting the nutritional needs of the vulnerable population. Statistics for 1982 indicate that there are more than 33,000 persons living in the District who are eligible for WIC or CSFP. In June 1983, WIC served 9,458 participants and CSFP served 7,009, a combined total of 16,467 persons or at least 16,533 persons less than the number in need.

Eligibility requirements for the two programs differ. The CSFP serves low income pregnant women, new mothers up to one year post partum, infants and children up to six years of age. WIC serves high-risk low income pregnant women, non-breast feeding mothers up to six months post partum, breast feeding mothers up to one year post partum, and infants and children up to five years of age. WIC participants must be certified to be at medical/nutritional risk, by a "competent health professional", to qualify for and to continue to receive benefits from the WIC program. These competent health professionals also prescribe the WIC foods.

The WIC and CSF Programs are both operated by the Department of Human Services. Organizationally, both programs are located in the Commission of Public Health. This organizational proximity ensures that maximum efficiency is achieved in operating the programs.

Question 3. You and Senator Andrews both made mention of participation difficulties by St. Stephen's Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia. The Department of Agriculture has indicated that the church had not applied for receipt of commodities until very recently. On what date do your records indicate application was made, and when was approval granted?

Answer 3. St. Stephens and the Incarnation Church never made formal application to D.C. Public Schools to receive commodity foods. As a result of inquiries made of D.C. School officials by several senators who were impressed by the work St. Stephens was doing in feeding people in need, the school system offered St. Stephens the option of receiving commodities. On June 20, 1983, D.C. Schools officially approved the request.

Question 4. Regarding the special distribution program for surplus commodities, what income criteria or other standards of eligibility have been in effect in your city since the program was initiated in December 1981 and what are they currently?

Answer 4. Since the inception of the surplus commodities program in January 1982 in the District, persons are eligible to receive food if they are recipients of any of the following:

General Public Assistance;
AFDC;
Food Stamps;
Medicaid;
Social Security benefits; or
Unemployment Insurance, if still seeking employment.

Additionally, persons whose unemployment benefits have terminated are eligible.

Question 5. Do you have any statistics on the income or other characteristics of those who have been served by the commodity distribution program in your city? Do you have any information on what percentage may be also receiving food stamps?

Answer 5. Persons eligible for any of the programs listed in item 4 above must show their respective program identification (e.g., Food Stamp ID Card) to receive surplus commodities. Eligibility for food is based solely on participation in these programs. No income or other information is maintained on these individuals.

Question 6. Would you outline the amount of surplus commodities that have been distributed in your city during each of the months since the program was first announced in December 1981? Has the city contributed any money to the distribution effort?

Answer 6. Since January 1982 more than two million pounds of food have been distributed to eligible individuals.

To date the City has not contributed to the distribution effort.

Question 7. With regard to the school lunch program, would you provide the number of students participating in each of the three income categories, and the amount of Federal assistance received for each such category during the past 3–5 years? What has been the city's contribution to this program?

Answer 7. The following is a breakout of statistics on the School Lunch Program for the 1982–1983 and 1983–1984 school years:

Lunches served	1982–83	1983–84
Total daily avearge served	44,300	46,000
Free and subsidized lunches	39,700	41,200
Federal share	$11,300,000	$12,400,000
D.C. share	$11,000,000	$11,000,000

Question 8. Would you outline what percentage of WIC recipients in your city fall into each of the six priority categories? For example, the first priority in the WIC program covers pregnant women, breastfeeding women, and infants determined to be at nutritional risk by a blood test—or some other documented medical condition.

Answer 8. The following is a breakout of the percentage of WIC participants who fall into each of the six priority categories:

Priority:	*Percentage*
1	24
2	12
3	25
4	10
5	25
6	4

These data show that 61 percent of the individuals (priorities 1–3) receiving WIC benefits have documented biomedical and/or anthropometric health problems.

Question 9. Aside from the Federal food assistance programs, does the City provide any city-financed food assistance? In what form?

Answer 9. Depending on whether there are related children in the home, the District contributes from 50–100 percent of the emergency assistance payment for food.

Question 10. With regard to the food stamp program in your city, do you utilize photo identification to prevent fraud? Have you used wage matches to detect unreported income and fraudulent participation? What is the overissuance error rate in your city?

Answer 10. Photo identification is required to redeem ATP Cards for food stamps. Wage matches are used to detect unreported income and fraud. During the latest QC sample period (10/82–3/83) the error rate for overissuances and ineligibles was 9.5 percent.

Question 11. How many people in your city (and what percentage) participate in the food stamp program? What has been the monthly participation in the program over the last 3 years?

Answer 11. Based on June 1 actual data it is anticipated that during FY 1983, approximately 94,109 persons in the District will be eligible to receive food

stamps. This represents 14.9 percent of the total population according to 1982 provisional census data.

Average monthly participation: Fiscal year 1981—99,898; fiscal year 1982—89,505; fiscal year 1983 (first 6 months)—87,734.

Question 12. How many cases (and what percentage of the caseload) were identified as fraudulently participating in your city's food stamp program as a result of an investigation by the Office of Inspector General?

Answer 12. During the 18-month period beginning June 1981, 176 cases comprising 0.44 percent of the food stamp caseload were identified as fraudulently participating in the program by the Office of the Inspector General.

Question 13. Several Mayors seem to suggest support expansion of Federal food assistance programs in time of economic hardship. As the economy improves, do you support a corresponding reduction in these programs?

Answer 13. We do not support a reduction in benefit levels however we strongly support programs designed to foster self sufficiency thereby reducing the number of persons requiring such assistance.

Question 14. Several Mayors stated or seemed to imply that program changes—usually characterized as "reductions"—in Federal feeding programs had contributed to what they perceived to be increased need. What, if any, specific program changes in Federal feeding programs do you believe have contributed to what is perceived as the increasing need for food? Which, if any, of these should be restored?

Answer 14. We endorse a food stamp program that will insure a nutritionally sound and adequate diet to all in need.

Senator ANDREWS. The next panelist is the mayor of Grand Forks, Mayor Wessman, a good friend of mine from one of North Dakota's principal cities, an individual whom I could probably tell a story out of school a little bit since Mayor Barry mentioned the fact he was frustrated over the MX missile when we need the funding for human nutrition. Mayor Wessman, of course, represents the town next to 150 of our Minuteman III missiles. Grand Forks Air Base, of course, controls those missiles.

If you think you are frustrated over the MX, I think one of the reasons why he brought up that warranty for our military procurement is not just some support of me but he knows first-hand up in Grand Forks they have tried three times to fire one of those Minuteman III missiles out of an operation silo and they have not yet gotten one out of an operation silo. This is our first line of defense. I shouldn't say that too loud, but I think the reporters have all left.

Mayor Wessman is the mayor of the city that has the first human nutrition laboratory that the U.S. Department of Agriculture put into effect. So he is well qualified to speak in the field of nutrition. Also, he is an instructor in physical therapy at the University of North Dakota Medical School.

Welcome. Glad to have you here. As you know, we would be glad to put your prepared remarks in the record as though every word was uttered and you can summarize it in any way you feel fit.

STATEMENT OF HON. H. C. "BUD" WESSMAN, MAYOR, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

Mayor WESSMAN. Thank you very much. Time is moving along so I will be very brief.[1] I just want to point out it has been an enjoyable experience for me this afternoon to listen to my more learned and experienced colleagues who have had an opportunity to discuss this issue.

---

[1] See p. 99 for the prepared statement of Mayor Wessman.

I present perhaps to you a bit of different environment, obviously, than the major city mayors, and yet I think I talk about a topic that intertwines so many factors of American demographics—the need for food, the production of food, and in North Dakota, as you indicated, we do have a very high level of efficient food production and food products production. You, Mr. Chairman, as a native North Dakotan, of course, are a prime example of the quality of the agriculturists that we have in this country today. But I think it is much to your credit and to the credit of your subcommittee that you would come to Denver and would actually take time from your busy schedule to hold this hearing, because those regulations, those rules, that legislation that you passed that is relevant to the Department of Agriculture, impacts as directly on the consumer in the city as it does on the agricultural producer, and it is to your credit that you would recognize this and you would be interested in the concerns that the mayors have.

In order to lend some credence to the testimony that I will summarize, I contacted several helping agencies within the city of Grand Forks. I visited with eight different agencies. I found many of the things that, again, the persons sitting to my left, with much more experience than I, found. I have many of the same comments. I just want to reiterate those for you.

I also did have an opportunity to look at the job services statistics from North Dakota, and I am aware that North Dakota has an unemployment rate which is considerably below that of the national average, running currently somewhere in the neighborhood of about 6.7, Grand Forks itself running somewhere in the neighborhood of 5.8. So it might be assumed we don't have the problems, and yet we have in fact the same sort of pressures on the commodities distribution and on the food stamp program that you have in the larger cities, only of a lesser magnitude from a number of standpoints.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I would just briefly summarize what we did find, and that is simply this, that it would seem the Grand Forks agencies, involved with both the food stamp programs and the surplus commodity distribution programs, felt that those programs are very, very necessary and in no way should there be a diminution of support of those programs at the Federal level, and in fact these programs could justifiably be increased in scope.

There are some programmatic problems with both of those particular programs. It would appear that some administrative funding, as was discussed earlier, would be certainly of some help. I did note one of the agencies that I contacted has indicated that for a relatively small amount of money they could double the distribution that they are doing right now. They simply indicated that because of the geographics up there in the State of North Dakota, they have a much larger area to cover and it is difficult to get to the outlying areas in order to make the distribution.

They also pointed out, and again something that has been said earlier, that we need to have an increase in the variety of the commodities—wheat flour and noodles, sugar, honey, potato products, other processed foods—the sort of things that would lead to a more well-rounded meal and also lead to a broader level of nutritional value.

There has been in our particular city, as in the larger cities, a tremendous outpouring of both voluntary and religious and civic

organizations that have come together in an attempt to meet the needs of those citizens who need food supplies, but it is obvious to us that this cannot, over the long haul, continue and that in fact there is need again for an increase in scope of the programs that are being discussed.

I think in our part of the country there is a real dichotomy that exists because in our rural environment, and some of the richest farmland in the world, there are people who still must depend on programs like food stamps and the surplus commodities distribution for their daily requirement, from a nutritional standpoint. There are people in our part of the country who are hungry. They are perhaps not starving; they are, however, using the commodities and the stamps to round out a needed nutritional intake, and as was pointed out again by people in North Dakota, just as in the larger cities, it invariably is the young, the individuals who cannot fend for themselves who perhaps don't understand the consequence, who don't get the sort of nutritional values that they need from the foods that are available, and it is that level that needs to be addressed and we have a concern about that in North Dakota just as we do in the other parts of the country.

So, Senator Andrews, I want to personally thank you. I want to commend you for your foresight. I want to let you know your leadership abilities are evident not only in North Dakota but in the country, and the fact that you would relate agricultural production and the ability of our part of the country to supply the needs for the other parts of the country from an urban standpoint is a positive example for us as mayors and for our constituents. So, thank you for allowing me to be a part of this.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you, Mayor Wessman, for an excellent statement. Let me ask one short question. What do you see as the major difference between our area and the larger American cities relative to the need and the effectiveness of the Federal nutritional program?

Mayor WESSMAN. I think the need is there in our part of the country just as in the larger cities. I think perhaps because of the more closely knit family units in our rural areas and, again, perhaps because of some of the higher level of stigma that is attached, and because of that closeness again you have a reluctance on the part of many of the people to go for what really they are entitled to, the commodity foods. You will see people who just will not want to go and get these sorts of things that they need. I think that is one of the biggest differences between the smaller rural environment and a larger city. But nonetheless the needs are there—the needs are real. The commodities are used, again, as a supplement for food stamps. They must be used as a supplement for food stamps because the food stamp program in and of itself does not provide the total nutritional needs for the elderly, and then also at the other end of the scale, for the young.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you very much, Mayor Wessman.

Thanks for those of you on the panel. It has been most instructive and will make an excellent record for us to go on.

[Questions submitted to Mayor H. C. Wessman, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., by Senator Jesse Helms, and answers thereto:]

Question 1. **Regarding the special distribution program for surplus commodities, what income criteria or other standards of eligibility have been in effect in**

your city since the program was initiated in December, 1981 and what are they currently?

Answer 1. Surplus commodities were first distributed in Grand Forks in February, 1982. At that time the local Community Action Agency, which administers the program, set a standard of 150 percent of the federal poverty level. When the program began, that meant eligibility was $6,465 for a single person and $12,675 for a family of four. In February, 1983 the federal definition of poverty was raised; the operative figures currently in use are $7,290 for a single person and $14,850 for a family of four. Neither assets nor age were used as criteria to determine eligibility; the sole criterion was income.

Question 2. Do you have any statistics on the income or other characteristics of those who have been served by the commodity distribution program in your city? Do you have any information on what percentage may be also receiving food stamps?

Answer 2. We do not have statistics on income or other characteristics of the commodity recipients, except that they are below 150% of federal poverty guidelines. A Community Development-funded survey, which will be tabulated in two or three weeks, will give us a little more information about commodity recipients. There are no figures on the number of commodity recipients who also receive food stamps. The local agency estimates that 55% of the commodity recipients also receive food stamps. They base their estimate on the following classes of people who receive commodities but who do not get food stamps; anyone falling between 130 percent and 150 percent of poverty; older people who qualify for food stamps but do not like to sign up for programs; transients and others whose lives are so irregular that they do not sign up for programs; those who find themselves temporarily unemployed.

Question 3. Would you outline the amount of surplus commodities that have been distributed in your city during each of the months since the program was first announced in December, 1981? Has the city contributed any money to the distribution effort?

Answer 3. Following is a list of the amount of commodities which have been distributed in Grand Forks since the program began:

Month and commodity	Number of households	Pounds distributed
February 1983: Cheese	1,700	8,500
April: Cheese	1,500	7,500
June: Cheese	1,600	8,000
October: Cheese	1,650	8,250
December: Cheese	1,600	8,000
January, 1983:		
Cheese	1,800	18,000
Butter	1,800	3,600
March:		
Cheese	1,800	9,000
Butter	1,800	3,600
Macaroni (local)	1,500	1,500
May Cheese	1,700	8,500
July:		
Cheese	1,750	8,750
Powdered milk	1,000	4,000

Grand Forks has had nine distributions at which an average of 1,675 households have received commodities each time. Approximately 97,200 pounds of commodities have been distributed; these commodities have an approximate retail value of $186,000.

The City has not contributed any money to the distribution effort. To this date, the Community Action Agency has not requested such funds, partly because they know our budget is quite tight and partly because we all believed this was to be a temporary program which could be handled by donated space, occasional volunteers and agency staff. Now that the program appears to be more permanent, some administrative support will be necessary. It seems to us that the federal government should earmark some administrative money to support the warehousing and staffing of the commodity distribution. The city would be willing to lend some staff assistance for unloading and distributing commodities. If the federal government continues to make revenue sharing available to cities in

adequate amounts we would be willing to earmark up to 1 percent of the value of the commodities for Community Action Agency distribution and supervisory costs.

Question 4. How many people in your city (and what percentage) participate in the food stamp program? What has been the monthly participation in the program over the last 3 years?

Answer 4. We have an average caseload of 1,098 households which includes 3,106 people. Benefits issued to these households totals $112,794 per month.

Question 5. Aside from the Federal food assistance programs, does the City provide any city-financed food assistance? In what form?

Answer 5. The city does not provide any city-financed food assistance.

Question 6. Several Mayors seem to suggest support expansion of Federal food assistance programs in time of economic hardship. As the economy improves, do you support a corresponding reduction in these programs?

Answer 6. There is a need to help transient families traveling across the country looking for work. There is currently no provision in the Food Stamp Program to help these individuals on a temporary basis. As the economy improves, reductions in these programs may be in order.

In general, as the economy improves, there should be less hardship and therefore less need for federal support programs. However, many specific groups do not necessarily benefit from general improvement in the economy. Those who are unemployed, those who are living on low social security benefits, those who are disabled, singled parent heads of households who are unable to go to work because they are raising young children, these groups, perhaps amounting to 10 percent of the population even in good times, still need support for basic necessities The aim is to reduce programs in a targeted way so that those still in need will be served.

Question 7. Several Mayors stated or seemed to imply that program changes—usually characterized as "reductions"—in Federal feeding programs had contributed to what they perceived to be increased need. What, if any, specific program changes in Federal feeding programs do you believe have contributed to what is perceived as the increasing need for food? Which, if any, of these should be restored?

Answer 7. Many of the program changes in the past year most greatly affect the working poor. This is most unfair because these individuals are paying taxes and trying to better themselves, thus being less of a burden to society. The following are examples of regulations that affect the working poor:

(a) Reduced the deduction from gross earnings from 20 percent to 18 percent. (This includes mandatory taxes and social security deductions, travel and clothing expenses related to work.) It is my opinion that an 18 percent deduction from gross income does not cover the expenses related to work.

(b) Child care and shelter deductions combined cannot exceed $115. For many working parents their child care expenses alone would exceed this $115 which leaves nothing left over to deduct for shelter expenses. It is my opinion that there should be a separate deduction for child care and shelter expenses and the limit be raised to a more realistic amount.

A number of federal programs have either decreased cash transfer payments or increased eligibility requirements so as to put greater pressure on people's ability to eat adequate nutritious meals on a regular basis. The benefit levels for food stamps have been decreased, while the eligibility criteria have been increased; the eligibility criteria for AFDC have been increased; funding for school lunch programs has been decreased; the WIC program was first decreased, but now with the Jobs Bills brought back up. In addition to food programs, other federal programs, such as Social Security Disability, have excluded more people who cannot in fact maintain regular emp'oyment. This has put greater pressure on those people's need for food. The increase in percentage of income which low income people pay for subsidized housing also decreases the amount available for purchasing food. Furthermore, the freeze on Social Security benefits and the fact that many of the so-called working poor are not in a position to command wage raises means that a significant population is losing 3–5 percent of their purchasing power this year (and perhaps 8–10 percent last year); the need for adequate food is a top priority for these people.

The program reductions which should be restored are less stringent eligibility requirements for food stamps and AFDC and an increase in benefit levels for food stamps. The commodity distribution program is not as essential to those

in need, but the commodities do provide a welcome supplement to other food programs. (The fact that 1,700 people in Grand Forks are willing to line up every two months for five pounds of cheese indicates a need for the commodity program). In addition, it helps a portion of the population who are not eligible for other federal programs, but who are being squeezed by increasing costs of other basic essentials such as utilities, transportation and health care.

Senator ANDREWS. We now have a panel of four individuals who work in the Denver area, if they would take their place.

Today we are very fortunate to have four people who have been working in the Denver area for a long time in this field. I spent some time this morning. In fact, I met two of you earlier and was very pleased with what you are doing. I found things are working a lot better in the Denver area than some of the testimony from other cities, as you have heard.

Our first witness is Jane Collins, who is the director of the department of clinical social work of the Denver Department of Health and Hospitals.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you.[1]

Senator ANDREWS. Let me assure you your full statement will appear as if given every word and you can summarize or highlight in any way you want.

STATEMENT OF JANE COLLINS, DIRECTOR, CLINICAL SOCIAL WORK, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HOSPITALS, DENVER, COLO.

Ms. COLLINS. The Denver Department of Health and Hospitals provides health care in four major service areas: Denver General Hospital in-patient services; emergency medical services; ambulatory health care services, including the decentralized neighborhood health program and the community mental health clinics; and public health services. Our funding is public and from a variety of city, State, and Federal sources. In my testimony, I will focus on the nutritional needs which come to the attention of our staff.

There are four major groups for which nutrition is an underlying condition of a medical care problem.

The first group consists of transient persons. They come to our emergency room and clinics without funds, often have acute illnesses caused by lack of food and shelter or their chronic illnesses have been made more serious by malnutrition and exposure.

The second group contains families and individuals—but usually families—where unemployment has used up all their resources. Frequently, they have no knowledge of community programs which could be of assistance and have been reluctant to let anyone know of their plight.

The third group is elderly persons living on fixed incomes—usually not in subsidized housing. As with the unemployed group, they may not be aware of food programs which would be helpful to them and may not wish their friends to know that they are in such desperate straits.

The fourth group contains parents and young children—the parents are frequently very young themselves and often without experience in food preparation or knowledge of adequate diet. This group is at

[1] As of press release Ms. Collins had not responded to written questions from Senator Helms.

very high risk because of the well-documented damage which poor nutrition and consequent malnutrition can cause pregnant or nursing women and infants and young children. Medical and nutritional research has repeatedly demonstrated that malnourishment in pregnant women can harm the infants. Malnutrition in infants or young children negatively affects physical and mental growth and can be irreversible.

A smaller group for which proper and sufficient food is essential to physical well-being is made up of persons with chronic diseases which are adversely affected by poor nutritional status. Diabetes is an example of such a disease. We have seen an increasing number of young persons with these illnesses who are unemployed or living on minimal incomes. Their physical conditions worsen because of improper nutrition and they may suffer permanent physical damage.

Without the variety of food programs—emergency foods, food stamps, supplemental foods—there would be practically no resources to which a public health system could refer patients who are without sufficient food or the funds to purchase it. These food programs include the voluntary ones supported by religious and other organizations and the business community. A review of our caseload shows that we see 18 to 20 individuals or families per month who are absolutely destitute for food. An additional 100 to 150 families or individuals are referred to food programs each month.

The department of health and hospitals, as a component of medical care, provides medical certification so pregnant and nursing mothers and children through age 5 may receive supplemental foods. In 1981, an average of 1,683 persons were certified each month, and in 1982, the monthly average of certifications was 1,467. Of the total 6,346 new persons authorized for supplemental foods in 1982, 2,566 were pregnant mothers; 2,180 were infants through 12 months of age; and 1,600 were children from 13 months to 5 years of age. All mothers receiving supplemental foods in 1982 were given a questionnaire and I will give some significant responses. Ninety-seven percent stated that those family members who receive supplemental foods have a better diet. Ninety-three percent felt they would find it hard to feed their families without supplemental foods. Ninety-eight percent like the supplemental foods and 83 percent use all the supplemental foods.

In closing, I would like to emphasize that the most skilled medical care is helpless when faced with the ongoing problem of malnutrition. And our populations most at risk are the most vulnerable in many other ways—young children, pregnant women, the elderly, and persons with certain chronic diseases.

Thank you, Senator Andrews, for this opportunity to discuss hunger from the standpoint of a public agency responsible for the protection and promotion of community health which had 593,700 outpatient encounters, 168,400 visiting nurse service home visits, and 12,800 admissions to the hospital in 1982.

Food programs are available, but frequently are not used to advantage because of the lack of coordination between agencies; because funding cutbacks have resulted in the loss of counseling and/or outreach staff and transportation programs.

The need for food is often seen in conjunction with the need for shelter. These services are usually provided by different organizations with more or less coordination. The result is that needy persons may not have access to both food and shelter. They may get food and have to continue sleeping in parks, on the streets, or in abandoned buildings.

Many young parents have no idea of how to prepare a nutritious meal. They have often grown up in homes where there was considerable disorganization and where they had no firsthand experience of homemaking. Their children are at risk of nutritional deprivation. Experience has shown that counselors who are trained in teaching parents how to prepare food can help young people become more adequate, not only in meal preparation, but in their roles as parents. Funding needs to be available so that such teaching services can be provided in conjunction with food programs.

Elderly persons, as well as young mothers, could profit from having someone come in to prepare meals. This service is available to persons on medicaid or those of a more affluent income level. For those elderly persons on a fixed income with no other benefits, food is skimped upon because rent and utilities must be paid. With food commodities available, transportation to pick it up, and when indicated, assistance in meal preparation, their nutritional status would be improved. Both physical and mental functioning in elderly persons have been shown to remain at a higher level when their nutritional intake is adequate.

Transportation should be provided so that food can be picked up and taken home. This is particularly important for mothers with small children and elderly persons. Although public transportation is available, it is not always possible for those two groups of people to use it and carry foodstuffs at the same time.

Outreach workers are needed to inform the eligible public of food programs. They need to visit congregate living sites, churches, community centers, and any organization where information can be disseminated to large numbers of people.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you so much for an excellent statement. What, in your opinion, would make the available food programs work more effectively for those persons for whom the program has been established?

Ms. COLLINS. I think there are two things which would be very helpful. One has to do with coordination between the various programs and agencies. In Denver, although there is need, there are a large number of food programs. Often people come needing both food and shelter, not just the one, and when there is no coordination between the food and shelter programs, then people may be given food but have to continue to be in the parks or in abandoned buildings.

The other point has to do with the cutbacks that have been made in the Federal programs. One of these cutbacks has meant that staff have been let go from nutition programs and other outreach programs. The result, which we see very much firsthand in terms of our patient populations, is that many young parents, and I am talking 15-, 16-year-olds, and on up into the twenties, have absolutely no idea of how to prepare adequate food for their children nor for themselves. They usually come from disorganized homes where they were not given any kind of

teaching. If there were nutritional counselors available who could show these young parents how to prepare food, not only would the young parents and their children be at much less nutritional risk, these nutritional aides could serve as role models in other ways for the young parent.

We also need outreach workers who can let people know about the food programs, help them make use of the services which are available.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you so much.

Our next witness is Alice Stark, who is the director of the Central Denver Community Service.

Welcome to our subcommittee hearing. Let me assure you that your prepared statement will be included in total in the record. You may summarize it in any way you wish.[1]

STATEMENT OF ALICE R. STARK, DIRECTOR, CENTRAL DENVER COMMUNITY SERVICE, DENVER, COLO.

Ms. STARK. Thank you, Senator.

I thought a lot about what I wanted to say here today and I felt, like the Mayor of Washington, in some sense I was preaching to the redeemed. But I think what I really wanted to do was to enlist your help and the help of the mayors here. Doing the kind of work I do, I am very close to the population that we are talking about. They are in and out of my office every day. I certainly am closer to them than a mayor. Yet the role of the mayor and the lives of his or her constituents are most politically intimate. Mayors are the most visible and the closest officeholders to the largest number of citizens, and the intimacy and the visibility may be the source of the old saw: "You can't fight city hall."

City hall is, in fact, the symbol of entrenched power and a target for hostility because it only operates on us and them mentalities. The us is those of us gathered here today, the bright, the clever, the wealthy, the powerful. The them are those who are not powerful and are considered a problem often by merely being alive.

The them and us concept is fallacious. They are part of us and we are part of them. But if we here today are collectively city hall, then I see a need to urge us to do something like fight the Pentagon.

Attempts to impose the so-calld New Federalism have faltered, but there is still an enormous amount of energy rallying to force mayors to take care of their own people. I assert it is virtually impossible for municipalities or for States to identify and limit responsibility, and it is equally impossible for the private sector: 500,000 sacks of groceries do not—cannot—compensate for the $5 million loss in food stamps.

In 1982 our agency alone restricted its assistance to persons who had lived in Denver for 90 days or more and we served over 31,000 people. We distributed about 50 tons of food, almost 1 ton a week, and if we had had the resources we could have served 3 times that many. Interestingly enough, about 60 percent of those people defined as resident by the 90-day rule had lived in Denver less than 7 years. Our mayor was often heard publicly talking about those people who come

[1] See p. 111 for the prepared statement of Ms. Stark.

here expecting, and yet simultaneously he laid out the welcome mat for new development.

The truth is, the boom dollars, however, trail after them the dollarless populations.

Emma Lazarus' poem on the Statue of Lib.. 'y invited the poor, the wretched, the huddled masses not only to our shores but to every city in the country—and the invitation still stands. Attempts to shift responsibility to city-State governments or to the private sector will, if successful, only serve to diffuse and render ineffective and irrational, efforts to feed the hungry.

The principal source of food for the poor is the USDA food stamp program. Whatever equity resides in that program comes from the fact that a displaced steelworker from Pennsylvania can collect food stamps the week he arrives in Colorado.

There are thousands and thousands of people whose only source of income is the supplementary food stamp program. Food stamps are used on the streets now for barter. There are thousands more who need stamps who have been cut off or have benefits drastically reduced. In cities this is a particularly difficult problem. The urban poor cannot keep a few chickens and a cow. Their resources are dumpsters in back of restaurants and supermarkets.

My real concern is that we see this as a crisis and yet sociologists and futurists have been talking for years about the accelerated pace of change and we have all nodded and been moderately worried about the quality of life our grandchildren might enjoy. Well, that remote "then" is now. John Naisbitt says we are living in an age of parenthesis between the industrial society and the information society. And I assert most of what we describe as "recession" is in fact "progression." Large numbers of people out of work now will never go back to work again, and we have a growing population of young people who have never held a job for more than a few weeks and may never do so in their lives.

This transition is traumatic because we are unprepared for it and unwilling to admit it exists. The Federal Government in particular clings to old solutions for problems with which we have never dealt, and the number of persons needing subsidy is going to grow and grow and grow, and that population cannot be dealt with piecemeal with differences from city to city or region to region.

As the poor, influenced by information exchange, lay aside all enmities in the face of poverty, they will become contentious, particularly as they are joined by the new poor. We have not yet experienced the violence of the sixties, which was confined to racial issues but were certainly given impetus by indifference to the problems of hunger and poverty.

Those efforts of the sixties were facilitated by the rapid exchange of information. Historically, urban societies have delt with the poor by segregating and containing them, but urban renewal has disrupted that pattern and the old ways won't work anymore, especially with the new poor. They don't know how to be poor and they don't want to learn. They take seriously the notion that the food stamp and aid to dependent children programs are defined as "entitlement" programs. They feel that enough to eat, a decent place to live and adequate medi-

cal care are not merely options of charity but obligations of just government.

I am concerned because outbreaks of violence on the part of the poor could be a tactical error because then one of the most expeditious means of handling them would be genocide. Violence would call for violence and we could commission the National Guard to shoot looters and arsonists on sight and we could thin out the ranks and cull out the troublemakers quickly. We would then leave a population more frightened and intimidated than the genetic poor have been in the past. Such action would, of course, raise the ire of meliorists who would reject outright genocide.

Very sadly, many of those same people are unaware of the fact that our national programs as they are constituted are slow genocide. These are the same persons whose response to hunger in their cities is a can of tuna fish and believe that surplus cheese for senior citizens can replace a viable food program for women, infants, and children.

Mayors are the closest target for every collective response in the electorate. In many ways that makes them the most powerful. They don't perform some mysterious functions thousands of miles from home. I would call on them to remember that.

Fiorella LaGuardia read the comic strips to the children of New York during the newspaper strike. Mayors should start reading to them the horror strips. You can educate your constituency to the gravity of hunger in this country. You can educate them to support efforts to alleviate hunger and teach them that the only solution for hunger is through effective, equitable Federal food programs. People can be taught that soup kitchens and church pantries cannot fill that need and that they are in fact an outrage. I and others like me have the compulsion to protest, to fight. We cannot fight city hall, but the elected officials here today have the expertise to fight. Explain to the people that listen to you that the child who starves is their child and no city is an island.

Thank you.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you very much.

You mentioned in your statement that you could do far more in the distribution of commodities if you had the resources.

Ms. STARK. That is right.

Senator ANDREWS. Did you refer to the resources of commodities or the resources of distribution ability?

Ms. STARK. Both. We are limited by space, by personnel, by the availability. Most of the foods we distribute we purchase.

Senator ANDREWS. You purchase with local funds?

Ms. STARK. Yes, church funds.

Senator ANDREWS. So it isn't a matter of the distribution network being set up and then suddenly shortchanged?

Ms. STARK. No.

Senator ANDREWS. Because commodities don't come through.

Ms. STARK. We doubled our intake in 1982. We doubled the space available. Our staff tripled. We have 64 volunteers who contributed some 400,000 dollars' worth of volunteer time in 1982, but we have just plumb run out of space.

Senator ANDREWS. I could see that in some of the places we visited.

Our next witness is Lynn Pennetta, who is the coordinator of the community food and nutrition program at Denver Opportunity, Inc.

I was most intrigued when I was at one of your operating stations this morning seeing what you are doing and encouraging people to come in and not only learn about nutrition but participate in by preparing food and made available for them to purchase. Lynn, we will be glad to hear your statement.

STATEMENT OF LYNN PENNETTA, COORDINATOR, COMMUNITY FOOD AND NUTRITION PROGRAM, DENVER OPPORTUNITY, INC., DENVER, COLO.

Ms. PENNETTA. Thank you.

I am Lynn Pennetta from Denver Opportunity. I am the coordinator of the community food and nutrition program.[1]

As you know, community food and nutrition programs used to be funded separately from the CSA. Now it is all contained in one block grant that comes to the State and through the State again through our agency. We have had such an influx, like Alice said, here, of people needing food that Denver Opportunity saw fit to keep our nutrition program even though we weren't funded any more. They just kind of absorbed it.

I am here today for two reasons. One, to present to the committee our program activity, and two, bring specific concerns to the attention of the committee.

About 3 years ago we started a food hotline. There were 30 food box programs around town but nobody knew where they were or nobody knew how to get them unless they knew somebody that either had been there or had worked there or volunteered there. So we started a hotline called 444 Meals. Its purpose was to get the hungry people in emergency situations some food.

The first thing we did when we called was ask them if they had applied for food stamps. Someone said when they asked for emergency food stamps the food stamp office told them they didn't have any. When we told them the buzz words "expedited issuance" and they returned to the food stamp office they got stamps.

The second thing was that there are so many people that have never been in this situation before. They had no idea where to go for food stamps, how to make the appointment or start the process. So after giving them directions and making sure that they knew how to go through the process, where to go and what to do, we gave them the food box program phone number and address closest to their home.

Then we put together a food box directory, which has some 53 food box programs in it, so that local agencies could find one in their neighborhood. People that called the 444 Meals hotline and wanted to donate food, we told them the food box program closest to their home so they could begin working with it, donate their food to it, volunteer time, see what was hapepning in their neighborhood.

One of the neat things that came out of it was that the cochampion food drive, as we call it, was put together. "Cochampion" stands for

[1] See p. 113 for the prepared statement of Ms. Pennetta.

community organizations combating hunger and malnutrition in our neighborhoods.

We found that some of the food box programs when was called them to make sure Mrs. Jones lived in the right neighborhood and met all the criteria for their food box program, they were closed because they had no food. So we said we have done all this work, put all this directory together and everything to get them there, then you are closed.

So when we started the cochampion food drive that was to get the food to the food box program so they could stay open. There is no sense in having a hotline if there is no one on the other end to help with the food.

Several times produce houses have called us and said, "We have crates and crates of lettuce" or bananas, and we have sent a truck out to pick them up. Then with the help of our food bank directory we have been able to get the food to the food box program or onsite feeding program or the sandwich line.

This last year our hotline was expanded quite a bit into where and when is the cheese distribution, what qualifications you have to have in order to get in line, how to get supplemental foods. We found some people have called when they have had problems with supplemental foods. They didn't get powdered milk or their formula was bad or something like that, at which time it was easy to call Ron Mikesell, director of Colorado Social Services Donated Food Section and we were able to get things worked out.

The other thing that has happened, seniors have called and asked where the onsite feedings were that were closest to them, senior meals or senior meals on wheels, things like that.

So it is really a terrific thing for us. It has helped out a lot of people.

The other thing I want to tell you about is self-help assistance. We did a survey of senior citizens in Denver about 2 years ago. We found out that most of the grocery stores in Denver in the local neighborhoods were getting moved out or closed down. So then all there was were the neighborhood stores which didn't have very much fresh produce and fruits.

Being in Denver here we are so close to the farms and I live in Brighton and I just saw all this produce going to waste out there, and it should be here where it belongs. We talked to some of the farmers' markets about having a day in certain neighborhoods where our low-income target areas were. They were saying no, they couldn't go over there, they were afraid of those kinds of people, they didn't accept food stamps, all these kinds of things.

So we decided, OK, how about giving us a good deal on the produce and we will bring it in ourselves. So we have had a really neat farm-to-market at some of the senior high rises where people, in kind of a gathering place, not only come and buy their vegetables and fruits at the same price we pay the farmer, but they also get recipes and communicate with other people, and sometimes they go through the line two and three times to spend their $2, and it makes me feel good that they have been able to buy a full week's supply for a couple of dollars.

The only thing, we can only do this in the summertime. With our new food preservation center, where we had our grand opening today,

they will be able to purchase in larger quantities and come into the center, then prepare it however they need it prepared, either without salt, without sugar, or however it tastes best to them, and be able to keep it for the winter.

One of the biggest things that I can say that is happening, that we will be able to save a lot of the food that is going to waste. When I first started going to the farms it just blew me away, all the food that was sitting out to be tilled under or they just didn't have enough manpower, it didn't grow well enough, the broccoli didn't head nice big heads like you get in the grocery store. So it was just left there to be turned under.

So what I am here today to do is to ask you two things, or three, since you are on the committee: That we need to expand the supplemental food or the list of commodities available for the food box programs. Like Alice was saying, they spend a lot of money on food and it is like we are buying powdered milk, you know, when there is powdered milk being dumped into the ocean, as the Department of Agriculture says, and you know, why is it being dumped, why are all these things happening, we are not getting any for the food box program.

The other thing is, if there are meats and things available for on-site feeding, and before we had food stamps, are these available now that could be going into the food box program.

The other thing I want to ask you to see if the efforts can be beefed up here to get a national gleaning bill. Several years ago Senator Hatfield of Oregon and Representative AuCoin had a bill, a national gleaning bill, which would give either a tax credit or a tax deduction for farmers who donated food.

Colorado has a new gleaning bill, but most of the farmers are saying they don't pay that much tax, State tax, as well as Federal tax, so they were saying if we get the two of them together it would be a better break for them and we might get them to donate it to us rather than till it under.

Senator ANDREWS. A good idea. Thank you for your statement. Thank you for your hospitality this morning.

[Questions submitted to Lynn Pennetta, of the community food nutrition program, at Denver Opportunity, Inc., by Senator Jesse Helms, and answers thereto:]

Question 1. What is the basis for your statement that "there is powdered milk being dumped in the ocean?"

Answer 1. Enclosed are: Letter from Judith Newton of Children's Foundation dated Feb. 21, 1980; Letter from Judith Newton of Children's Foundation dated Feb. 22, 1980; Copy of Fred Gillies article in The Denver Post on or about February 16th.[1]

These three documents refer to my discovery in February 1980 that the City and County of Denver Commodity Supplemental Food Program had been out of powdered milk for pregnant and nursing mothers the whole month of January and until that point in February. As it turned out, the same shortage applied to the whole state of Colorado.

After making all the contacts I knew of to alleviate this grievous situation, the milk finally arrived in Colorado on February 19th.

But, as Ron Mikesell pointed out in the Post article, "It is hard to catch up on nutrition."

[1] The above referred to enclosures have been retained in committee files.

One week later, Feb. 25, 26, 27, 1980, I attended a meeting of the National Anti-Hunger Coalition in San Antonio, Texas.

Enclosed are the agendas for that meeting.[1] During one of the round-table discussions of local problems including the Colorado problem of the powdered milk shortage, one of the participants stated that USDA had discovered a sizable portion of stored powdered milk had become contaminated with worms and was dumped in the ocean.

Question 2. What percentage of your money is Federal, State, local or private?

Answer 2. The budget for the Community Food and Nutrition Program of which I am Director shows the following percentages: Federal/State (CSBG)—54.1; Local—20.6; Private—25.3.

Senator ANDREWS. Our final witness in this panel is Hendrika Cantwell, M.D., consulting pediatrician of the Denver Department of Social Services.

Dr. Cantwell, nice to see you. I enjoyed the visit we had in your facility earlier today. Glad to hear your testimony this afternoon.

STATEMENT OF HENDRIKA B. CANTWELL, M.D., CONSULTING PEDIATRICIAN, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES, DENVER, COLO.

Dr. CANTWELL. Thank you, Senator.[2]

May I go back to one thing, I wanted to say on infant mortality, which was mentioned by the Mayor from Washington, D.C., that we had a similar experience here in 1967 when our outreach medical facilities were begun on a Federal demonstration grant. In the poor or ghetto part of the city there was an infant mortality rate of 34 per thousand, roughly; in the rich part of the city about 18 per thousand live births. One year later with good medical care and with the outreach programs that Jane talked about, which we have since lost—mainly nutritionists and the home visitor type programs—but in 1 year of the outreach medical centers we had a mortality rate that was 17 and 18 per thousand in the two separate areas.

Senator ANDREWS. That has cut in one-half, the mortality rate.

Dr. CANTWELL. That's right.

Senator ANDREWS. Was that because of improved medical care or was it largely due because of improved nutrition?

Dr. CANTWELL. No, I don't think that was largely nutritional. Nutrition services had something to do with it. It was that people could get to their clinics and, therefore, very young babies who would become ill could be given medical care much sooner than they would otherwise because they couldn't get to Denver General. I worked in parts of town where you had to take two or three buses. It would take you over an hour to get to Denver General from one of the very poor parts of town.

Senator ANDREWS. The child may well have been born healthy but because the child didn't get the right kind of pediatric advice and pediatric care?

Dr. CANTWELL. And also nutritional. That was part of the pediatric care that was offered.

Senator ANDREWS. I was interested in making that point.

---

[1] The above referred to enclosures have been retained in committee files.

[2] See p. 115 for the prepared statement of Dr. Cantwell.

Dr. CANTWELL. It was very dramatic. I don't know what our infant mortality is now because I don't think we have anybody to do it.

As the last person on this afternoon's program, I would like to take the prerogative of the naturalized citizen to express my thanks to the country which adopted me. I have been here 40 years and I have been very well fed by the incredible agricultural progress that this country has made over the years that I have been here. To feed not only all of us one way or another—maybe not always in the pleasantest way and sometimes by having to stand in line—but I would like to bring to your attention that the countries which were the food basket of Europe when I was a child have, under the period of their totalitarian governments, become very hungry countries. And we must not forget this is the best-fed country on Earth and everybody basically can get food, and that is really what my basic position is and I am very grateful to agriculture for doing so well.

What I do, I am the pediatrician for the Denver Department of Social Services which deals with children who are abused, neglected, or come because of sexual abuse or other maltreatments. I see probably about 150 new children per month who are new to the protective services. I do not generally see very many children who are truly hungry, I cannot speak for adults, I only see children. I do speak with their parents. I think there is some struggle to get the food, there is no doubt about it.

We see people who don't have a job, who don't have money, who don't have housing, and who do not have food, which causes increases in cases of abuse and neglect. It is a contributing factor, without any question, and I must report to you once again, congratulations to the agriculturalists because that is the easiest one we find to solve, is to find food. We can almost always find food for people. It is much easier to find than adequate housing, much easier to come by than to get them some money. I find that there are places we can go, such as this nice lady just mentioned.

The marginal family, I think, benefits tremendously from the commodities and I would support the idea that more commodities be included. There is something about being handed food. I think it is much harder to get rid of on the black market than are food stamps.

The school lunch program, I think, is very essential in keeping our older children well nourished.

The families who have not found access to the ordinarily available agencies which distribute food directly are finding food at other places such as the shelters at churches. Even street people, I know quite a few of them, seem to know where to find food.

So all I can say is that in my opinion not only is the food grown in great quantities in this country, but it seems to be working in Denver quite well also as to the distribution. As I said before, not always the way one might like it, to buy it with money in the store. But then I guess nobody promised us a rose garden.

The food stamp program, I think, is much maligned with the cheaters, I think the majority use the program well and I think we should not fall into the trap of punishing the majority of people who use it well by the minority of people who are cheaters. I really would rather

overlook them. I don't think we are going to cure them. I would rather just go to the majority and continue to give them food stamps.

When I find children who are hungry and come to the center, I find that they are not hungry because of the unavailability of food but, rather, because of the available food being misused. Children, starting at age 4 and over, begin to say things like, "Mommy won't cook for us, she always goes out and leaves us," or "She spent the money on booze, now there is no food." "Daddy sold our food stamps because he wanted to have a party."

There are many variations on this theme. I feel the problem is much more one of misspent money, of misattention to details such as feeding the child and a carelessness of the importance of nutrition rather than the unavailability of food.

Now, because I am a pediatrican I would like to talk a little bit about a few of the things which are definitely not problems related to food. The first one is a major problem: Maternal deprivation. It is not a food issue. It is an issue of a parent who is unable to feed a child, unable to nurture the child. They are parents who are unable to give adequate care to the child because they have a deficiency in their makeup which makes them unable and that is not related in any way to food availability.

It is very difficult to teach people how to feed these children, availability of food does not help the problem; it is far more deep seated than that, and really one of our major difficulties in the field of abuse and neglect.

We have a corollary to that, and that is emotional deprivation, which is an older child who does not grow. Again, the child is getting enough food, in fact some of these children hoard food, overeat, but it is an emotional and psychological deprivational dwarfism which does not allow the child to grow. Those two are very serious medical problems.

The next one I see is the drug/alcohol abusers where the children are not fed because there is no food for them, available money is all going elsewhere. Serious problems such as fetal alcohol syndrome, where the mother during pregnancy drinks excessively may give birth to a baby who will never grow normally. You can feed the baby all its life, it will not grow well. It has lost the ability to make new cells at a normal rate.

So, we have a number of things I would like to see pehaps improved, increased or added onto. The first one probably is that outreach teaching is very much to be recommended. I find a very large number of young families who, basically, when it comes to cooking really haven't the foggiest idea what you do with anything other than to buy it at McDonald's.

TV, which someone else mentioned, I feel very strongly about, also. I think it is almost criminal the kind of advertising that is just pushed at people who do not have the resistance to sort it out and say, "This is incorrect information, about Twinkies and Coke and pizzas and beer." If we are interested in nutrition in children that is a place a lot of money should be spent, to make worthwhile what we are trying to do; namely, to get good food into people, and particularly because it is so important to children's growth and development. I think we should really counter with some very, very high-powered, well-done television

shows that make that very clear to people, what is good nutrition and why it is good nutrition, and to have it maybe more dramatized.

Along with that, I would suggest that the money be spent on inticing people to places where good nutrition is taught along with availability of food. If you are going to have people come to something they don't want to come to for some reason, the best way to do is to make it fun with games. Especially with some of your really young families, have picnics with the children, or have Tupperware parties with commodities instead of Tupperware. Where they do this in a group setting it might help and perhaps improve the usage of what they receive.

Thank you.

Senator ANDREWS. Thank you so much for your statement. And, Doctor, I can't help but hear you when you said how very important nutrition education is. Did I read you wrong?

Dr. CANTWELL. You read me very well.

Senator ANDREWS. The great need is to make sure that the people in this country have in their hands the information about sound nutrition, and that, followed with the availability of food, will do wonders for the things we are concerned about.

Thank you all for your excellent presentations.

The subcommittee will adjourn.

[Whereupon, at 5:30 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to call of the Chair.]

[The following exchange of correspondence between Chairman Helms and Senator Andrews, the subcommittee chairman, clarifies an erroneous news report of the Denver hearing.]

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1983.

Hon. MARK ANDREWS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MARK: Last week I read an account of your hearings in Denver in Tuesday's Washington Post. I have myself been misquoted so often by the Post that I don't ever assume that the paper has quoted anyone accurately.

One of the charges, as reported by the Post, is a very serious one—the allegation of "mismanagement and inefficiency" in the USDA surplus commodity distribution. I think I should discuss the details of this with Jack Block. I am certain that the Secretary would be interested in correcting any mismanagement and inefficiency occurring in his Department.

Also, I am confident the Post overstated your comment on surplus commodities. Obviously, the CCC does not have "tens of billions of dollars worth of surplus commodities". The latest figure of uncommitted CCC inventories was about $4.4 billion, of which 68 percent were in dairy products.

I am eager to have the details in this regard so that I can pursue this subject with the Secretary.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

JESSE HELMS, *Chairman.*

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1983.

Hon. JESSE HELMS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JESSE: Thank you for your recent letter concerning the account of the hearings I held in Denver that appeared in the Washington Post.

I've had my staff look over the transcript to the Denver hearing and nowhere did I make the remarks attributed to me in the Washington Post. The "tens of billions" should read "tens of millions". The media has been juggling billions for millions for so long that I suppose that is standard operating procedure.

I might suggest, Mr. Chairman, that since this was an official hearing of the subcommittee, your staff has the same access to the official transcript of the hearing that I have. My memory, as well as my staff's scrutinizing of the transcript, leads me to believe that the statements actually given were not the same as those reported. I am sure you understand how those problems come about.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

MARK ANDREWS, *U.S. Senator.*

[The Washington Post article referred to in both letters follows:]

[Reprint from Washington Post, June 14, 1983]

MAYORS SAY HUNGER IN CITIES IS GROWING FASTER THAN AID

(By Howard Kurtz)

DENVER, JUNE 13.—A dramatic increase in the number of city dwellers going hungry is outstripping federal and local efforts to care for them, mayors from every region of the country said here today.

The mayors placed some of the blame on administrative problems in the Agriculture Department's distribution of surplus food. Some mayors, including Dianne Feinstein of San Francisco, said their allotments of surplus cheese and butter had been cut because of heavy lobbying by the grocery industry.

Detroit Mayor Coleman A. Young, calling the problem "probably the most prevalent and the most insidious" facing cities, told the 51st annual meeting of the U.S. Conference of Mayors that the economic recovery has not been broad enough to alleviate the recession's legacy of unemployment and hunger.

"In the past, the term 'economic recovery' used to mean a reduction in human suffering because people were back to work," said Young, the conference's president. "We now have a new definition, under which individuals may continue to suffer but profit margins start to increase."

A rapid proliferation of soup kitchens, food pantries and emergency telephone "hot lines" has failed to keep up with the growing demand for food, according to the mayors' conference report to a Senate agriculture subcommittee. The report examined eight cities of varying economic health and found that five—Detroit, Denver, Nashville, Oakland and San Antonio—were having to turn away some hungry residents.

Sen. Mark Andrews (R-N.D.), the subcommittee chairman, blamed the problem on "mismanagement and inefficiency" in the Agriculture Department's distribution of surplus commodities. At the subcommittee's hearing here, he said, "We have tens of billions of dollars worth of surplus commodities. We have hungry people in our urban areas. And somehow we aren't able to get them together," he said.

Nashville Mayor Richard Fulton said that although five million pounds of surplus butter and cheese were stored in his city, federal officials told him it was earmarked for other regions and could be used before the completion of paper work that would take at least 60 days. When he finally won approval to hand out some butter and cheese, Fulton said, it had to be shipped in from elsewhere in the country.

"The lines are getting longer, and the people are getting younger," said Fulton, who is encountering new delays in trying to distribute surplus corn meal, dried milk, rice and honey. "The people who come to get their cheese are people with whom I had gone to school. It is embarrassing for them, and it is embarrassing for me."

Bud Wessman, mayor of Grand Forks, N.D., said that he can't afford to get surplus butter and cheese to outlying areas but that with $10,000 for administrative costs, "we could handle twice the amount of commodities each month."

Here in Denver, where unemployment is a relatively low 7.4 percent, city officials distributed almost twice as much food last year as in 1981. More than 100 food banks are providing packaged food to these residents, many of whom are living in city shelters and boarding houses. One thousand people reportedly line up each day for hot meals at the city's food centers.

Jane Collins, director of social work for Denver's hospitals, said that emergency rooms here are seeing a growing number of transients whose illnesses are caused by a lack of food and shelter. Hospitals see about 18 to 20 patients a month who are "absolutely destitute for food," she said.

Detroit has had a five-fold increase in emergency food aid since 1980, Young said, with up to 50,000 families receiving surplus cheese and butter every month and 250 people calling the mayor's food "hot line" every day.

The number of people needing emergency food has doubled or tripled in the last year in Cleveland, New Orleans and Rochester, N.Y., although those cities have managed to meet the demand, the mayor's report said.

Oakland officials said that they are unable to get supplemental food to 30,000 people who need it. And, while 10,000 families received food aid in San Antonio last year, 50,000 are expected to ask for help this year.

Earlier today, Sen. Ernest F. Hollings (D-S.C.) told Democratic mayors here that his rivals for the presidential nomination cannot win the White House because they are viewed as big spenders.

"If [former vice president Walter F.] Fritz Mondale or [California Sen.] Alan Cranston was elected tomorrow, instead of a $200 billion deficit, there would be a $400 billion deficit," he said. "The B1 bomber, the MX—Cranston and [Ohio Sen. John] Glenn are voting for them right on down the line. I just don't think we can really afford them."

Hollings said that he would spend $14 billion on increasing teachers' salaries and would finance the program by scrapping the MX missile.

APPENDIX

STATEMENT OF HON. JESSE HELMS
A U.S. SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. Chairman. I was unable to be in Denver for the subcommittee hearings, and, quite candidly, had not planned to make a statement for the record.

Having reviewed the hearing record, however, I was frankly astonished at the level of foundationless rhetoric that was included in the testimony, especially from mayors who one would hope--as executives of some of our largest cities--would have had a better understanding of U. S. agriculture and nutrition policies. Because so many of these policies and practices seem so widely misunderstood--or misrepresented--I feel compelled to address a number of issues raised by the witnesses.

In the hearing, the mayors seemed to attempt to foster the general public's impression--portrayed by the media and liberal politicians with increasing frequency--that the nutritional state of the poor in our country is foundering. The impression--sometimes implied in the news stories and occasionally boldly stated by critics--is that there are millions of poor Americans going unserved by the Federal feeding programs.

It seems that this picture of nutritional gloom has been painted almost gleefully by those who have opposed in a partisan way the present Administration from the outset. They now seek to conjure up an image of widespread hunger in an apparent effort to discredit the Reagan Administration's broad economic program.

I suppose one should not be surprised that this is the perspective of big-city--predominantly liberal--mayors, especially inasmuch as six of the eight who testified are Democrats.

Additionally, the "report" prepared by the U. S. Conference of Mayors, entitled "Hunger in American Cities", portrays a similarly bleak situation. Anecdotal stories are plentiful, but there is little hard, factual data about the situation. Indeed there is not even a definition of what constitutes "hunger in American cities". There are few raw numbers or other documented evidence from which one could gauge the magnitude of the situation--either those being served or those who are alleged to be unserved--or compare it with previous years. Statistics and percentages can be juggled in such a way as to imply large in-

creases in demand when, in fact, small numbers of people actually may be involved.

Much of the media, it seems to me, has collaborated, intentionally or unintentionally, in this effort. Hence, the increasing perception is that there is a major problem with nutrition for the poor in this country.

The difficulty with this scenario--in the testimony, the report, and the news stories--is that there is a noticeable absence of factual data on which to base such a conclusion. Indeed, there is simply no objective, rational, or scientific basis for this perception of a "resurgence of hunger in America".

Legislative Background: The Food Stamp Program

The first premise of the allegations against the Administration seems to be that massive reductions in spending for nutrition programs have occurred since the Reagan Administration took office, the underlying assumption being that such reductions are a or, for some, "the" cause for alleged nutrition program inadequacies.

In the food stamp program, for instance, the common perception seems to be that large reductions in benefits and participation were made in the past few years. That is not accurate. The most that can be said is that the rate of growth has been slowed. The program continues to cost more each year than it did the year before. More people are being served by it each consecutive year.

For instance, food stamp expenditures have increased by more than 42 percent in the past 3 fiscal years. In 1980, total cost for the 50 States and the District of Columbia was $8.3 billion. This year, the program is expected to cost approximately $12 billion, not including $825 million for Puerto Rico which now operates a separate nutrition assistance program.

Similarly, average monthly participation, as recorded by the Department of Agriculture, has increased from 19.3 million in 1980 to an estimated 21.4 million people this year. Monthly participation hit a new record high in March 1983 when the number of participants apparently peaked at 22.4 million. Such increases are striking evidence of the program's continuing responsiveness to serving the unemployed poor.

Those reductions which have been made are exceedingly reasonable, and could not have resulted in the bleak picture currently described by critics. The largest reduction in the 1981 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act for food stamps, for instance, was to provide that food stamp recipients should receive benefits on a pro-rated basis, depending on the time of month in which they applied for benefits. Previously, households, were entitled to a full month's benefits even if they applied during the last few days of the month. It was obvious that such recipients could not eat retroactively.

Hence, Congress, in response to a report from the Senate Appropriations Committee which first called attention to this excess, established pro-rated benefits. It is a good example of how improved management can result in large savings. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the new pro-rata system would save a half a billion dollars annually. The provision has worked so well that in 1982 the same principle was applied to other Federal programs.

The other major cost-saving change was to delay the indexing of food stamp benefit increases. As noted in an April 29, 1983, study by the Congressional Budget Office, the savings resulting from delaying the indexing of benefits were significantly overstated.

Additionally, the 1981 Act delayed indexing of deductions, and established for the first time, a gross income ceiling for food stamp participation at 130 percent of the poverty line. The cumulative effect of these changes was to tighten program eligibility and reduce the rate of growth in the cost of the program--which had resulted in large part because of the liberal indexation policies which had existed in the program.

Also, strikers were eliminated from participation in the program, and counties and States were permitted to establish workfare programs for able-bodied food stamp recipients.

This is hardly the record of an administration, or a Congress, which has been unresponsive to the true needs of the poor.

The 1982 reconciliation Act made very modest changes in the food stamp program and none in the child nutrition programs. Again, indexing of the food stamp benefits was a primary method of attempting savings, by establishing the annual increase in benefits at 1 percent under the rate of food price inflation.

Other savings were achieved by administrative tightening of the program, including an improved definition of eligible households, rounding down benefit calculations to the nearest lower whole dollar, and prorating of the standard utility allowance.

The major food stamp change in 1982, as in 1981, did not come from an across-the-board reduction. Rather, in 1982, the largest savings in the bill--$615 million over a 3-year period--was from the imposition, for the first time, of an error rate sanction system to require States to lower their overissuance error rates to certain levels or else reimburse the Federal Government for errors above those levels.

In both years, a primary objective of the legislative changes has been to tighten program administration in order to prevent abuses of the program. Tighter verification of eligibility, more stringent penalties for abuse (by both recipients and retail stores), and greater latitude to collect fraudulent overissuances have been important new tools added to the food stamp legislation.

Additionally, contrary to charges that food stamp "buying power" has declined, the converse is true. While the cost of food purchases for home consumption has risen 20 percent since 1980, average monthly food stamp benefits have risen 24 percent. Three years ago, according to the Department of Agriculture, the average monthly benefit was $34.35 per person. This year the average monthly benefit is about $42.75 per person. Food stamp benefits are adjusted annually on October 1.

School Feeding Programs

The primary reduction in the school lunch and breakfast programs has been to reduce the Federal subsidy for meals served to non-needy children. Many people are unaware that such a large portion of the Federal support for the school feeding programs is actually provided regardless of the income of the children's family.

Inasmuch as over half of all lunches are served to non-needy children, it is obvious that significant savings could be made without impacting poor children at all. Even with the reductions made by the 1981 Act, a significant subsidy continues to those who are not needy.

Child Care Food Program

As with the school feeding programs (lunch and breakfast), reductions in expenditures for the child care food program have been targeted at non-needy children. Even with the changes, however, a recent USDA study indicates that over two-thirds of participants in day care homes come from non-needy homes and receive federally subsidized meals and snacks.

The effect of the changes which have been made has been to increase the percentage of Federal dollars going to recipients who are poor. For instance, the percentage of Federal dollars going for needs-based programs in the child nutrition area has increased from 58 percent in fiscal year 1980 to 73 percent in the present fiscal year.

Special Supplemental Food Program
for Women, Infants, and Chilren (WIC)

Those who include WIC in the list of Federal food programs that have sustained "cutbacks" apparently are simply ill-informed, or are deliberately misinforming others. The WIC program has increased--in both expenditures and total number of recipients in each of the past several years. This has been possible in the immediate past most notably because of low inflation rates which have permitted more food to be available to more people for the same dollar value. Appropriations have increased, and continue to provide increasing numbers of families with assistance.

Summer Food Service Program

The summer food service program has had modest reductions in funding, primarily aimed at eliminating participating agencies

with a history of fraudulent mismanagement of the program. This program had been reknown for years as being especially susceptible to fraud and abuse, particularly in large cities where it was concentrated. Elimination of private sponsoring organizations in the 1981 Act focused the program in areas where governmental sponsors would administer the program.

However, it should be noted that there is no indivdiual means test for participation in the summer food service program. Hence, there is no factual basis for determining whether poor children are, as intended, the primary users of the program.

Food Stamps: Who Qualifies? Are the Benefits Adequate?

One of the most commonly mentioned indictments of the present food stamp program is that the monthly food stamp allotments are not providing for all the food needs of poor households.

Such a charge reflects either a lack of understanding of how the food stamp program operates, or an attempt to mislead the public into thinking that something that was being provided has been revoked or curtailed.

First, some background on the program's operation. Eligibility for participation in the food stamp program is contingent on meeting three primary requirements specified in the Food Stamp Act of 1977.

Income. The income test requires that an eligible household's gross monthly income fall at or below 130 percent of the official poverty guidelines established by the Office of Management and Budget. These guidelines vary to reflect household size. (Note: For households containing elderly and disabled individuals, the income test is a "net" income test which must fall at or below 100 percent of the poverty guidelines after certain deductions, if applicable, have been applied. Using "net" rather than "gross" income for the elderly and disabled permits somewhat higher gross income standards to apply for these two types of households.)

Between July 1, 1982 and June 30, 1983, the following income poverty guidelines have been in effect for those who must meet the 130 percent of income test:

Food Stamp Eligibility
July 1, 1982 - June 30, 1983
Gross Income at 130% of Poverty Guidelines*

Household Size	Monthly Gross Income	Annual Gross Income
1	$ 507	$ 6,080
2	674	8,090
3	841	10,090
4	1,008	12,090
5	1,174	14,090
6	1,341	16,090
7	1,508	18,100
8	1,675	20,100
For each additional person, add	167	2,000

(Note: Separate limits apply for Alaska, Hawaii and for U.S. territories.)

*For households containing elderly or disabled members, net income, after deductions--rather than gross income--is the income eligibility standard.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture

Effective July 1, 1983 and through June 30, 1984, the following income standards of eligiblity will be in effect.

Food Stamp Eligibility
July 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984
Gross Income at 130% of Poverty Guidelines*

Household Size	Monthly Gross Income	Annual Gross Income
1	$ 527	6,318
2	709	8,502
3	891	10,686
4	1,073	12,870
5	1,255	15,054
6	1,437	17,238
7	1,619	19,422
8	1,801	21,606
For each additional person	+182	+2,184

(Note: Separate limits apply for Alaska, Hawaii and for U.S. territories.)

*For households containing elderly or disabled members, net income, after deductions--rather than gross income--is the income eligiblity standard.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture

Assets. The second test for eligibility is the assets test. Food stamp households (regardless of size) may not own assets (primarily savings accounts and other liquid assets) which exceed $1500, not including a house or car. (Note: For households with members who are elderly or disabled, the assets limit for a household of two or more is $3,000.)

Work Registration. The third test applies to individuals who are designated as able-bodied and between the ages of 18 and 60. They must register and be available for work.

Once eligibility for initial food stamp program participation has been established, monthly benefits are determined based on income.

For determining benefit levels (and, in the case of elderly and disabled, also for determining eligibility) a series of deductions are subtracted from the household's gross income. These currently include:

A standard deduction, for all households, of $85 per household per month;

A deduction equal to 18 percent of any earned income of the household;

A deduction for any dependent-care expenses related to employment, education, or training for employment;*

A deduction for shelter expenses, to the extent they exceed 50 percent of the household income remaining after all other deductions have been subtracted out.*

*In households without elderly or disabled members, the total of the dependent-care and shelter expense deductions cannot exceed $115 per household per month. In households having elderly or disabled members, there is no limit to the amount of the shelter expense deduction, although dependent-care expenses deductions are still limited to $115 per month, and, additionally, medical expenses of any elderly or disabled member are deductible to the extent they exceed $35 per month.

The amount of a household's monthly food stamp allotment is the difference between 30 percent of its countable ("net") income and the maximum food stamp allotment for that household size.

The following table outlines the maximum monthly allotments by household size in the continental United States:

Maximum Food Stamp Allotments
October 1, 1983--September 30, 1984

Persons in Household	Maximum Allotments
1	$ 75
2	139
3	199
4	253
5	300
6	360
7	398
8	455
Each Additional member	+57

*Note: Allotments for recipients in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam and the Virgin Islands are higher than those in the continental U.S.

In effect, the participating household is expected to spend 30 percent of its countable income for food, and the food stamp program makes up the difference between that and the amount needed for a low-cost adequate diet. The amount needed to purchase a low-cost adequate diet is set by the United States Department of Agriculture's "Thrifty Food Plan", as translated into maximum monthly food stamp allotments for various household size and updated annually for changes in food prices.

Households with no countable income receive maximum monthly allotments; those with higher incomes (relative to family size) receive lower allotments.

Therefore, except in cases in which the household's after deduction income is zero (so-called "zero net income" households), some income is judged to be available to the household for the purposes of purchasing food.

Except in these limited cases--usually less than one-fourth of the entire caseload--households are expected to contribute from their own income to purchase food. Among these recipients with

relatively higher incomes, food stamp benefits serve as a supplement to regular food purchases, and have never been intended to supply all of the household's monthly food needs.

The percentage of household income that is attributed as being spent on food purchases is known as the "benefit reduction rate". Since 1977, the benefit reduction rate has been 30 percent. Thus, for every additional dollar of countable income (after food stamp deductions), benefits are reduced by 30 cents.

Prior to 1977, households were required to contribute some 30 percent of their countable income to the Federal Government in return for the larger value food stamp benefits. This requirement for a cash contribution to participate was known as the "purchase requirement". The purchase requirement was fully eliminated in 1979; its elimination was phased out over two years, between 1977 to 1979. Elimination of the purchase requirement is largely attributed to be the single greatest cause for the rapid expansion in both cost and participation of what is now widely known as "free food stamps".

An example of the calculation of benefits is presented in the accompanying table.

Characteristics:

A 4-person household living in one of the 48 contiguous States or the District of Columbia; 1/

Gross monthly income of $500, consisting of $250 in earnings and $250 in unearned income;

Shelter expenses of $300 per month; and

Medical expenses attributable to a disabled member of the household of $70 per month.

Calculation of food stamp countable income

Gross monthly income	$500
Less standard deduction	-85
Less 18 percent earned income deduction	-45
Less medical expenses above $35 monthly 1/	-35
Less a shelter expenses deduction 2/	-135
Countable income	203

Calculation of food stamp benefit

30 percent of countable income (expected household contributions to its food needs)	$61
Maximum monthly allotment for a 4-person household as established by the Thrifty Food Plan 3/	253

Food stamp allotment (benefit) equals the difference between the maximum allotment and 30 percent of countable income 192

1/ Available only if the claiming household member is elderly or disabled.

2/ The shelter expense deduction equals any shelter expenses exceeding 50 percent of the household income remaining after all other potential deductions have been subtracted. The shelter expenses deduction would be limited to $115 if the household did not have a disabled member.

3/ Benefit levels vary for Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. The figures presented here are applicable for October 1982 through September 30, 1983.

Running Out at End of Month

Hence, the idea that food stamp recipients may "run out of benefits" at the end of the month, as is sometimes claimed, does not account for the household's cash contribution (which is to represent 30 percent of countable income).

Additionally, food stamp benefits--whether for those with no income or for those who have some countable income--are predicated on being sufficient to obtain a low-cost nutritious diet. Those of any income obviously will not have enough to last the month if they do not shop and prepare meals prudently. The level of food stamp benefits distributed to each family is not intended to be lavish, but sufficient to achieve a nutritious diet inexpensively. The food stamps will be exhausted prematurely if they are spent on high-cost foods and specialty items; they will not provide good nourishment if they are not spent on nutritious foods, but neither result is the fault of the program itself (before or since the Reagan Administration).

"Running out at the end of the month" is a phenomenon not restricted to low-income food stamp recipients. Careful planning is necessary. It is also not a new occurrence brought on by the Reagan Administration, as is sometimes implied. As noted earlier, food stamp benefits in the past 3 years have been increased in value relative to actual food prices. Indeed, Americans of all income levels have benefited from the low inflation rate of the Reagan Administration. Food dollars go further--regardless of income level.

Lack of Accessibility Doubtful

The implication that low-income Americans are unaware of their eligibility for the food stamp program, as is sometimes claimed, appears totally fabricated. The program has been established for almost 20 years, and has skyrocketed in the past 10. It is one of the most pervasive Federal programs in the country, currently serving one in every 10 Americans.

Most recently, food stamp participation has increased to meet the needs of those who are newly unemployed who are poor. The program is not meant to serve those, even if unemployed, who are

program is not meant to serve those, even if unemployed, who are not poor. Despite attempts by the Administration's opponents to portray that the unemployed are languishing across the countryside, somehow victims of Reaganomics, the average income of families on unemployment was recently found to be over $19,000--clearly well above the food stamp eligibility level, except for very large households.

The idea that households with this level of total income should be eligible for Federal food stamp assistance is unreasonable, even if the household contains an unemployed member.

The food stamp program was intended, and should remain, for those who are low-income and in need through no fault of their own. While I certainly want to see a reduction in unemployment--indeed, I am pleased by recent economic news confirming its arrival--the nation cannot afford to expand the food stamp program and similar programs for the poor beyond the truly needy. The level of eligibility is already set 30 percent above the official poverty level. In short, those who are in need are being served. The existing Federal feeding programs have responded to the needs of the poor brought about by higher unemployment, as they were intended to do.

Fraudulent Participation

If there has been one overriding problem with the food stamp program during recent years it has surely not been that there are too few people participating. Rather, it has been that many who are ineligible have received benefits and that many who participated legitimately received more than they should have.

Proponents of the program often dismiss such concerns as trivial. However, fraudulent overissuances in the food stamp program cost over $1 billion annually, not a trivial amount in my judgment.

Unfortuntately, some of the worst problems are in large cities. Indeed, three cities whose mayors testified in Denver have been the subject of audits by the Office of Inspector General. Significant overissuances due to unreported income were found in each of these cities.

So the significant problem is that large numbers of people who are receiving the food stamps are ineligible for the amount of benefits they are receiving. If those who claim to have such concerns for feeding the poor would expend as much effort in eliminating fraudulent participation, the program's focus would be properly targeted to those in need.

Liberal advocates for these programs have increasingly failed to distinguish between what one author called "the deserving and the undeserving poor". However, more recently these advocates have begun to fail even to distinguish between the poor and the non-poor. They seek to create the appearance of increased poverty, and hunger, when such is not the case. "Poverty" and "hunger," appear to be used more as political epitaphs against

the present Administration than factual descriptions. Thusfar, the facts have not been allowed to stand in the way.

I commend the many efforts of churches and private organizations that have established various feeding programs. It should be remembered, however, that such organizations generally do not have eligibility criteria for participation. Nor is there any method to determine whether, in fact, many of those served by such organizations are not also receiving some degree of Federal feeding assistance. Additionally, it is quite possible that those receiving Federal assistance are participating in more than one feeding program.

Commodity Distribution

Apparently running a close second to the food stamp program in terms of misperceptions is the distribution of surplus commodities initiated in December 1981.

Although commodities used in various commodity donation programs are popularly spoken of as one broad category, there are two distinct types of commodities which are distributed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These types of commodities are acquired and donated under different authorities and circumstances.

The first category of commodities are those which are acquired under the price support programs of the Department. These are commodities commonly referred to as "surplus" commodities, and are the only ones which have been distributed widely by the Department in the recent "commodity distribution program". The Department of Agriculture uses two principal methods of supporting farm prices: (1) nonrecourse loans to farmers and (2) Government purchases in commodities. In the case of nonrecourse loans, price-supported commodities are acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) when a farmer forfeits the crop used as collateral for the loan (generally when market prices are below the amount of the loan plus accrued interest).

The following commodities are "price supported" through nonrecourse loans and may be acquired by the CCC: wheat, rice, barley, corn, grain sorghum, oats, rye, soybeans, honey, upland and extra long staple cotton, peanuts, tobacco, and sugar. (Only price-supported commodities which can be used for food use and which are in surplus have been for distribution.)

The second method of supporting commodity prices--through direct Government purchases in the market--is used primarily to support the price of milk.

In recent years, actual CCC acquisitions of price-supported commodities have been primarily dairy products. Approximately 67 percent of the $5 billion value of CCC stocks at the beginning of fiscal year 1983 were dairy products. (As great as the dairy stocks are, however, it is factually inaccurate to assert, as one mayor did, that the butter in the CCC represents one-half of the world's supply.)

Rice, wheat, corn, grain sorghum, soybeans, honey, and some nonfood commodities (e.g., cotton) comprised the remaining existing stocks held by the CCC. A substantial portion of price-supported commodities, especially corn and wheat, are held in farmer-held reserves and are not available to the CCC for donation.

The second category of commodities donated by the Department are perishable agricultural commodities. The commodities in this category are primarily meat, poultry, fruits, and vegetables. Under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1933, the Secretary of Agriculture is permitted to purchase perishable commodities to remove surpluses of those commodities in the markets. These commodities are subsequently donated, under section 32 and other authorities, to schools for use in the national school lunch program and to certain other regular Department of Agriculture feeding programs such as feeding programs for the poor sponsored by charitable institutions. These commodities are often described as "section 32 commodities" or "surplus removal" commodities, and are not affected by the Secretary's decision in December of 1981 to distribute "surplus" commodities.

The jobs bill earlier this year did provide some funding specifically for the purchase and distribution of these section 32 commodities. They may be distributed only through school lunch programs, charitable organizations which operate a soup kitchen, or other on-site feeding operations.

There seems to be a widespread perception that USDA warehouses are "bulging with surplus commodities"--as is so often stated.

The problem is that, to the extent that there are any "bulges", they are almost exclusively in dairy products--cheese, butter, and non-fat dry milk. There simply are not surpluses of most other farm commodities. There is some rice and cornmeal, and these are being made available by USDA, along with honey. The availability of all of these commodities for distribution is contingent on the volume of Government-owned surplus. (It should be added that the Federal policies which have fostered such surpluses are already under review, and legislation to correct them has been reported from our Committee. It should not be the policy of the Federal Government to encourage the acquisition of surpluses that will dampen farm prices or to establish an expectation that such surpluses will be available in future years.

To suggest, as two mayors did, that USDA has in surplus and should be making widely available bread, meat, vegetables, canned goods, sugar, and potato products is either the height of misunderstanding of the complex commodity programs, or of demagoguery.

The Government does not own uncommitted surpluses of bread, meat, vegetables, canned goods, sugar, and potato products. Indeed, only in the case of sugar is there even a Federal price support program for an item included in the "wish list" of some of the mayors. (While wheat is a price support commodity, it is stored, if in surplus, in raw form or possibly as flour, but is never maintained as bread.)

The notion that somehow there are massive quantitites of surplus commodities being withheld from the American people is absolutely false. Those who spread such information, knowing it to be false, are doing a great disservice to the American public--taxpayers and recipients of Federal feeding programs alike.

It is, indeed, ironic that the Reagan Administration, which initiated the commodity distribution concept for cheese in 1981, is now criticized for somehow "not doing enough".

It seems to me that the Secretary of Agriculture has been attempting to balance competing interests and has done a fine job. I regret that he and the President have been made the objects of such unwarranted, and in many cases, uninformed, criticism.

I make the effort to correct these erroneous perceptions in such detail in the hopes that those who may hold them may be exposed to an explanation of the workings of agriculture and nutrition programs, and that the facts may be laid out to challenge those who delibertately attempt to spread misinformation about these programs and policies.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1983.

Hon. JESSE HELMS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JESSE: Senator Hollings has told me that he plans to be in Denver on June 13, and wishes to participate in the hearing the Subcommittee on Rural Development, Oversight, and Investigations will be holding on the Federal food and surplus commodity distribution programs.

As you know, Senator Hollings is particularly interested in effective Federal legislation to afford adequate nutrition to our Nation's citizens.

Senator Hollings has also told Senator Andrews of his interest in participating in the hearing and possibly asking questions of the witnesses.

I would greatly appreciate your assistance in providing Senator Hollings the courtesies we afford our colleagues in such cases.

Sincerely,

WALTER D. HUDDLESTON.

STATEMENT OF HON. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, A U.S. SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

Thank you Mr. Chairman. It is indeed an honor to be here today to discuss the problems of hunger and food distribution with our distinguished panelists. I welcome them and look forward to their thoughts and comments.

Whenever I'm with a group discussing hunger, it leads me to think of that saying by Henry Adams: "Practical politics consists in ignoring the facts." But this problem can not be ignored and the practical politics is no politics. But as we all know, that is a difficult message to convey to the present Administration.

It was some 15 years ago that I stumped my home state and other parts of the nation to learn first hand the story of hunger and poverty in America. What I and others discovered was shocking. There were literally millions of underfed and hungry people in this land of plenty. Cases of Kwashiorkaor and other starvation related diseases were found. In many poverty areas, rates of nutrition deficiency diseases among our children equalled those of third-world countries.

But this country exhibited its greatness and responded with a noble effort to eliminate hunger from our midst. And for a time we were succeeding. Yet now, as we all are aware, hunger is starting to come back.

The first reason for this is our current economic position. Millions of American families, who never in their wildest dreams could have imagined it, are now without jobs and destitute. They are victims of that hoax called "supply side." They have been mugged by an arrogant and irresponsible Administration that gambled with their futures, cut taxes for the wealthy few, and drove the economy to its knees. These are our neighbors and friends. These are the same people who studied hard, worked hard, and rightly expected to enjoy the fruits and security of the American dream.

Yet now they are faced with indefinite layoffs, expiring unemployment benefits, and depleted savings. They have had to choose between heating and eating during the winter. They have had to wait in food lines at their own churches in order to make it through the month.

Some have dubbed this group the "new poor." But new or old, they are hungry, confused, and frightened. And, they deserve better.

Another reason for the resurgence of hunger is what I like to call "check-out line" analysis. We've all heard it—the constituent who complains about seeing some person buying steak or filet with food stamps. Indeed, our President has made it an acceptable form of social comment when he talked about the fellow who bought an orange with food stamps, used the change to buy a pint of vodka, and then enjoyed a screwdriver. But when the President was last in either a food or liquor store is the question I would like answered.

Yet the image of the so-called "cheater" persists. And for a program such as food stamps, the effect is invidious. The American people, who are sincere in their belief that none of our citizens should go hungry, soon begin to believe the story and withdraw their support.

And it isn't just some crank or extremist that plants these fables. That would be bad enough. It is also the Administration that continues to play games and recycle ugly myths. It is the Administration that continues to let the public believe the program is fraught with fraud and abuse when it isn't. It is the Administration that continues to imply that the Democrats are irresponsible spenders when Jimmy Carter and the Congress cut the fat, waste, and fraud out of the program in 1980 and 1981. It is the Administration that continues to cry for more cuts—a billion dollars in this year's budget—when we have already cut the program by over $3 billion per year for the last two years. In short, it is the Administration that lies instead of leads.

But what the Administration doesn't tell anyone about is how the program works or who it serves. It doesn't tell you that benefits now average less than 47 cents per person per meal. It doesn't tell your that over one-half of the recipients are children or that 78 percent of the recipients are either children, the elderly, the disabled, or single parents. It doesn't tell you that the average monthly household income of recipients is under $350. And, it doesn't tell you that most of the unemployed are unable to get food stamps because they are fortunate enough to still own a car or some other personal asset.

Another trend that must be reversed is the short-sightedness of our policy makers. By this I mean the "penny-wise and pound foolish" attitude that exists when we fund many of our nutrition programs.

Part of this is due to the problems of misinformation and myths that I just mentioned. But equally devastating is the refusal of many in Congress and the Administration to look at the facts. Without a doubt, there are few government programs as effective as those in the nutrition area. And this is particularly true with regard to our children.

For example, take the Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). Every $1 spent on the pre-natal components averts $3 in hospitalization costs by significantly reducing the number of low birth-weight infants. The neonatal mortality rate for infants born to WIC mothers is only one-third that of comparable groups.

Or, look at the child nutrition and school lunch programs. Even the Department of Agriculture, which cut the program by 30 percent last year—the largest cut in any entitlement—has released studies that show these programs having substantial nutritional impacts on children, particularly lower income children.

And you in local government know that the cost-efficient saving from these programs are not exclusively federal. These savings reduce Medicaid, AFDC, special education, and other programs that are part of everyone's budget—federal, state, and local.

Yet the response of the Administration is more B–1's and MX's and less nutrition. More for programs that are ineffective and fat and less for programs that are effective and starving.

And finally, we are seeing more hunger because our local agencies simply can not handle the load. Americans can and will pull together. But local food programs are literally overwhelmed by the magnitude of those who need help.

For example, last year over one-half of the emergency food programs saw their case loads increase by 50 percent. A third of the programs saw a doubling in the number of recipients. Because of this, nearly a fourth of the agencies had to turn people away and two-thirds are now limiting the number of times a person can get food. Usually it is now once a month.

And the people being served are changing. It is no longer the fellow looking for a bowl of soup and sermon. More and more it is the newly unemployed and more and more it is entire families with children. Additionally the number of families who are seeking aid because their food stamps no longer last through the month is increasing at a dramatic rate.

But again the Administration is callous and uncaring. The same crowd that preaches "volunteerism" refuses to fully unshackle the necessary forces for success. We need to not only free up the millions of pounds of commodities rotting in warehouse but we must give the state and local governments the wherewith-all to deliver them.

As we can all see the problems we face are immense. We have economic social and political barriers to hurdle before we can eliminate hunger in this country. Right now we are going backwards. But I am confident that it is not impossible. All that is required is leadership and candor. The American people will respond.

STATEMENT OF HON. GARY HART, A U.S. SENATOR FROM COLORADO

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony today on the effectiveness of the surplus commodity distribution program. I appreciate your taking time to travel to our state and hold hearings on this important subject.

While there are some indications the economy is beginning a slow recovery from last year's severe recession, the number of people out of work remains at a postwar high. The current recession has caused widespread unemployment and increased hardship for low-income families in Colorado and throughout the nation. Current unemployment in Colorado, while considerably below the national average, is at the highest level since the end of World War II. Unemployment is particularly acute in small, Western Slope towns where, because of falling oil prices, the bottom has fallen out of energy and mining activities. Perhaps just as hard hit are the rural farm communities throughout eastern and southern Colorado where the lowest farm prices in fifty years have taken their toll in foreclosures, bankruptcies and liquidations, and the human miseries associated with these crises.

This unemployment has dramatically increased the number of people who are in desperate need of food and adequate nutrition. It is imperative that we continue to address the food needs of our citizens who are suffering the effects of the present recession, particularly the unemployed, the young and the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, efforts made to date to provide needy citizens with surplus government-owned commodities are a step in the right direction. Given the vast size and volume of present government reserves and the needs of the jobless and elderly people throughout the country, we can and should be doing more. An expanded distribution program will be beneficial to the needy persons by providing supplemental nutrition assistance while also helping the farmer whose prices have been subject to downward pressure from the largest reserves of commodities in recent history.

We have needy people throughout America and the food to feed them. Unfortunately, the present Administration refuses food to children—undermining the future strength of this country—and turns its back on the needs of our elderly.

As a cosponsor of Senator Dole's legislation to expand this program, I insist that we make every effort to make additional commodities available to eligible recipient agencies over and above the commodities that are currently being distributed by the Department of Agriculture.

This legislation is an effort to use surplus agricultural commodities to the fullest extent possible to help those in need and to improve the domestic distribution of surplus commodities. This will make available all government-owned surplus food commodities, including dairy products, rice, soybeans and honey, at no cost, to eligible state and local assistance agencies. These agencies presently administer activities and projects to improve nutritional assistance to relieve emergency situations and distress. I believe Senator Dole's legislation is a practical and effective approach to meeting the emergency food needs of the American people. I hope we will have an opportunity to consider and enact this legislation in the near future.

Perhaps just as important as the emergency distribution program are existing programs established to help the poor secure an adequate diet, including the WIC program. WIC is the short title of the Special Supplemental Food programs for Women, Infants and Children. The legislation that established the program in 1972 set a goal of preventing health problems and improving the nutritional status of financially needy women, infants and children. The program is designed to supply nutritious food to this target group during critical periods of growth and development.

There is growing scientific evidence to suggest the program is effective. It has been shown in study after study to be a cost-effective, economical approach to improving the health of some of our most important citizens.

Unfortunately, under the present Administration, the program has been scaled back and become less available to those it was originally intended to help. Although WIC is serving only an estimated one of every three potentially eligible persons, the Administration's FY 1984 budget request proposed no change in funding for the program. According to the Congressional Budget Office, more money will be required next year to maintain existing participation levels. No

additional funding will result in a reduction of average monthly participation by over 100,000 mothers and small children during the coming fiscal year. Waiting lists for this program—lists that grow longer every month—are a national disgrace.

Shortsightedness can and will cause incalculable damage to this nation's future. We must pay particular attention to the needs of our children. The brain of a young child has development potential that it will never have again. If adequate nutrition is not available, the likelihood of long-term impairment is greatly increased. Thus, the importance of our emergency distribution efforts to reach growing numbers of children disadvantaged by the current recession cannot be over-emphasized. A child's development cannot and should not be forced to wait for economic upturns.

I believe we have made an important first step, but I also believe there are many opportunities yet to be fully examined and utilized. The WIC program is a dairy intensive effort to help disadvantaged women and children. The present dairy surplus in this country is at crisis levels and yet, we have been reluctant to channel a portion of this huge surplus to existing WIC programs. This simple step alone would contribute to our ability to expand WIC, enabling us to reach growing numbers of potentially eligible participants. Further, this will take pressure off dairy producers througbout the country.

WIC is but one example of many existing programs which could be supplemented with surplus commodities to better reach disadvantaged people throughout the country. I encourage the Chairman and the Committee to examine the potential for supplementing existing programs with surplus commodities from government-owned storage facilities.

Mr. Chairman, we have hungry, needy people in Colorado and throughout the nation. We also have the ability to address their needs during this period of economic recession. Our efforts can be made in such a fashion to benefit both the needy people and the American farmer, while at the same time, ensuring the most efficient use of the taxpayers' dollars. I believe these hearings are an important opportunity to examine the present program and discover areas where our efforts can be strengthened.

Once again, I thank and commend the Chairman for holding hearings on this important issue and I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments for the record.

STATEMENT OF HON. COLEMAN A. YOUNG, MAYOR, DETROIT, MICH., AND PRESIDENT OF THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. I am Coleman A. Young, Mayor of Detroit and President of the United States Conference of Mayors. On behalf of the Conference, I wish to thank you for giving Mayors meeting here in Denver an opportunity to speak out on what is perhaps the most prevalent and detrimental problem facing American cities today—the problem of hunger.

Detroit and other cities across the Nation, large and small, are experiencing the fallout of a national economic disaster. Fallout such as business failure, plant closings and double-digit levels of unemployment. The cities' abilities to provide critical emergency services such as food, shelter, medical care and energy assistance are stretched to their limits, but yet, thousands of urban residents have never been reached by these services.

Mayors have brought the shortage of these emergency services to national attention. In October, 1982, the Conference of Mayors conducted a survey on the combined impact of federal budget cuts, economic conditions, and high unemployment on urban residents. The report found that in the 55 cities surveyed, in not one of the human service areas examined was even 50 percent of the eligible population served in fiscal year 1981 or fiscal year 1982. Shelter and food were identified as most in demand. More and more of the Mayors in this country became increasingly concerned about the growing numbers of the homeless and hungry people in their cities.

In late November, 1982, the Conference of Mayors Standing Committee on Health, Education, Employment, and Human Services was convened in an emergency meeting by its Chair, New Orleans Mayor Elmer N. Moriel, to discuss emergency service needs. The Committee made recommendations to Congress and the Administration for specific actions needed to avert a national tragedy that winter.

Although Mayors are concerned about several emergency problems, hunger, as I said earlier, is probably the most prevalent and the most insidious. There has been much media attention directed to the reemergence of hunger in America. But, little uniform information about the problem has been available. That is why the U.S. Conference of Mayors, with the support of the American Can Company Foundation, undertook an examination of hunger and its related problems in eight cities—Cleveland; Denver; Nashville; New Orleans; Oakland; Rochester, N.Y.; San Antonio; and my city, Detroit.

Mr. Chairman, as part of my written testimony, I submit a copy of the study findings for the record. To summarize the study findings, I'd like to point out the following:

Despite differing local economic conditions and rates of unemployment, all of the cities examined experienced a dramatic recent increase in the demand for emergency food assistance.

All eight cities agree that unemployment is a primary cause of increased problems of hunger. The official unemployment rates in February, 1983 of the responding cities range from 20.6 percent in Detroit to 7.3 percent in San Antonio.

All eight cities have received some U.S. Department of Agriculture surplus commodities.

Five of the eight cities are not able to serve all of those in need of food assistance.

The study findings submitted to this Committee provide greater detail about the pervasiveness of hunger in the eight cities examined. I would now like to conclude my testimony by turning to the problem of hunger in my city, Detroit.

On December 7th of last year, I declared a "State of Emergency" for the City of Detroit and announced a survival program to help destitute Detroiters avert starvation and freezing during the coming winter. And, I petitioned the Governor of the State to declare a state of emergency for the city. A State Hunger Proclamation by the Governor followed several weeks later.

The ravages of the national economic depression had devastated the people in Detroit. For example:

Between 1980 and 1982, there was a five-fold increase in the number of households served by emergency food providers;

Two-hundred fifty calls for food per day to the Mayor's Emergency Food Hotline, over 26,000 in all since it was established in September, 1982;

An actual unemployment rate of 25 percent;

Twenty-five hundred persons exhausting unemployment benefits every month;

Thirty-five to fifty thousand families receiving surplus cheese, butter and milk every month;

An infant mortality rate of 34 per cent in impacted poverty areas;

410,000 persons on public assistance—one-third of the population of the City; and

150,000 people receiving food stamps.

In response to my declaration of a "State of Emergency," a substantial effort has been mounted by both the public and private sector in the City. The City's Neighborhood Services Department is the focal point of City government activities. It has initiated a variety of services this year to deal with hunger and malnutrition including:

Operation of an Emergency Food Hotline through which referrals are made to emergency meal providers, clothing supplies and shelters (99 per cent of the calls are food related). Through the Hunger Hotline, 72,000 persons have received emergency food packages since December 19, 1982. 770,000 pounds of food have been donated to that effort by private citizens, civic groups and businesses throughout the area.

Distribution of USDA surplus foods. Between October, 1982 and May, 1983, approximately 4.9 million pounds of surplus commodities of cheese, butter, milk and rice have been distributed to some 450,000 persons.

Additionally, in December, the City became a sponsoring agent for USDA commodities for on-site consumption. Through this effort, 190,000 persons have been served.

Support for the start-up of soup kitchens. Before December 7, there were six functioning soup kitchens in Detroit. There are now eighteen. The City's programs service sixteen regularly.

Support of food co-ops. In December, there were 93 emergency food pantry operations. There are now an estimated 206.

Many private organizations, often in conjunction with the City, have also taken steps to respond to the problems of hunger in Detroit.

The United Auto Workers and General Motors Corporation have initiated a food collection and corporate matching food donation program. The food is distributed through the Neighborhood Services Department, the local United Food agency, and United Community Services' grantee agencies;

Over 100 Detroit church groups are now operating emergency food and/or meal programs;

Focus: HOPE provides prescription foods to 35,000 persons per month and distributes surplus commodities on a daily basis;

The Southeastern Michigan Food Coalition advocates for, coordinates and supports local food collection and distribution programs:

The Automobile Association of America runs Operation Food Basket, through which it collects food from employees and clients and contributes it to the City's emergency food program operated by the Neighborhood Services Department, and to other food pantries in the Detroit area.

Local food retailers contribute food to the City's emergency food program.

Emergency food services in Detroit reach only a small fraction of the total population in need of them. Most of these services are intended to provide at most a three or four day supply of food, and only for the most needy. In most cases, such assistance is inadequate to meet the continuing needs of those who frequently have to wait for weeks to qualify for public assistance or who have no public assistance at all available to them.

Despite the tremendous response to the problems of hunger that has been made by all sectors in Detroit, there are a number of areas in which we need additional help. To handle perishable commodities such as cheese and butter, more private-sector contributions of refrigerated warehouse space, refrigerated truck-trailers for transportation, and commercial coolers to ease handling are needed. The City needs additional soup kitchens, ones that offer services seven days a week.

AMERICAN CAN CO.,
Greenwich, Conn., June 13, 1983.

Hon. COLEMAN YOUNG,
Mayor of Detroit, President, U.S. Conference of Mayors.

DEAR MAYOR YOUNG: Your report on hunger in American cities which we were pleased to underwrite makes clear in statistical and poignant ways a tragic and inexcusable condition in our country. There is no reason why hunger and inadequate nutrition should be allowed to persist in the richest country in the world.

As one of the largest suppliers of food packaging in this nation, we are particularly concerned by the findings of your study and are firmly committed to effective ways of combating this problem. Towards that end, the American Can Company Foundation has identified the issue of hunger and nutrition as one of its major focal points for action. We will also contribute our corporate experience and expertise when and where we can.

In other words, Mr. Mayor, we wish to be a responsible partner in the public and private efforts to eliminate hunger and malnutrition. In that regard, I share your concern that federal food and nutritional support programs have failed to meet the growing needs in the recent years of high unemployment.

Please offer my appreciation to Senator Andrews and the Senate Agriculture Subcommittee on Rural Development, Oversight and Investigation for convening the hearing at which you are representing our report. I applaud them for raising public awareness of the problem and offer our assistance in identifying the policies and programs that can most quickly and effectively provide food to the hungry.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. WOODSIDE.

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD H. FULTON, MAYOR, NASHVILLE, TENN.

The rapid increase in people asking for food assistance from local and private agencies in Nashville and Davidson County is symptomatic of a persisting pain and hunger. This increase can be attributed to a number of economic conditions and their attendant social effects.

These include: Unemployment; illness or disability among wage earners; family breakdowns and separations; loss of child care resources; ineligibility for public assistance programs and insufficient benefit levels; loss of federal Social Security or SSI benefits; and ineligibility of exhausted unemployment compensation benefits and increased costs of food and other necessities.

The emergence of the "new poor" is also seen a contributing factor. People moving from another city to Nashville in search of a job are often ineligible to participate in federal programs because they lack a permanent address.

To meet this increased demand for food assistance, Nashville-Davidson County relies upon a combination of federal and local government programs as well as those of voluntary and church organizations.

We, in Metro Government, have witnessed this increase in the number of applications accepted for food and other basic needs:

(1) The Metropolitan Social Services Family Assistance Program provides temporary financial assistance to persons in need due to circumstances beyond their control. Qualified applicants receive cash assistance to be used as they determine for food, shelter, or other basic necessities. This agency accepted a 75 percent increase in applications from January 1982 to January 1983. As a result, the agency spent $41,560 in monthly cash grants in January 1983 as opposed to $33,774 in January 1982. The 1982–83 budget for cash assistance is approximately $400,000. With the exception of $35,000 in reimbursement for SSI payment, the budget is financed with local taxes.

(2) The Metro Action Commission, our local community action agency, has several programs which aid in the provision of food. These include:

Community gardening
Community cannery
Summer lunch
Transportation of elderly persons to congregate meal sites
Head Start
Surplus dairy commodities distribution
Information and referral service
A nutrition hot line

Between 1981 and 1982, Metro Action had a 66 percent increase in Food Bank box deliveries. In addition, there was a 33 percent increase in the number of children served in the summer food service program between 1981 and 1982.

(3) The Metro Health Department provides food commodities to low-income pregnant and post-partum women and to children under the age of six. This program witnessed an increase in the number of women and children participating by more than ⅓ from approximately 9,000 in November 1981 to more than 12,500 in February 1983.

Unless the State Department of Agriculture increases the caseload allowed for Nashville-Davidson County, some of these women and children will no longer receive the assistance they need.

In the Fall of 1981, I appealed to Nashville's 740 churches and others in the private sector to work in partnership with Metro Government in addressing the growing human service needs, including the need for food and shelter. Since then, a strong collaborative relationship has developed between our public and private sectors which has resulted in a number of efforts to assist the needy.

"Help Line," a networking system that coordinates activities related to food assistance among local churches and social service agencies, is an example of such efforts.

Other specific examples include:

Area churches have set up soup lines and lunch programs on a first come-first serve basis.

Nashville's Union Rescue Mission which now serves 600–800 meals each day.

The Salvation Army which feeds about 150 people per day. In addition, it has arranged to dispense vouchers for motel rooms to homeless families. It planned two neighborhood feeding centers, where free lunches are served and also a "kitchen on wheels" was organized to serve soup and sandwiches in an area where people are unable to transport themselves.

In still further attempts to address the problem of hunger in our community, several special projects have been organized:

Second Harvest Food Bank, a joint effort between the public and private sectors to collect and distribute food in Metro Nashville, receives support from the Metropolitan Action Commission and also relies upon contributions to maintain its activities.

Second Harvest provides emergency assistance with prepared food boxes. Each box contains enough food to feed three people over a three day period. Referrals are accepted from government agencies and other participating organizations.

In December 1982, the Food Bank distributed nearly 1,500 food boxes, a 66 percent increase over 1981. Since then the Bank's distribution has continued to increase substantially depleting its inventory. The number of agencies and sites which participate in the Bank has also more than doubled from approximately 50 in 1981 to 122 in 1982.

"The Good Samaritan" program supported both by Metro Government and the Tennessee State Government was designed in 1982 to coordinate resources in order to assist elderly persons in 15 neighborhoods in Nashville.

The program focused on meeting the nutritional needs of the elderly by increasing the quantity and quality of food available to them.

Two coalitions were formed in Nashville to advocate better and expanded food programs: Mana Inc. advocates the expansion and improvement of federal food programs, provides food stamp outreach and nutritional education, and sponsors a Child Care Food Program for family day care providers; The Tennessee Hunger Coalition works to make more food programs available to minorities and others.

I became personally involved in the food assistance effort in February of this year when, in an effort to maximize the distribution of USDA surplus dairy products, the Metropolitan Government requested to be designated as a food bank.

This differed from the previous effort in December 1982 when the state government coordinated the distribution.

I would like to take this opportunity to communicate that experience to this panel.

In February, the media brought to my attention the fact that 1.6 million pounds of butter and 3.6 million pounds of cheese were lying idle in a Nashville warehouse. Upon contacting state and federal USDA officials, I was informed that it would not be possible to distribute that surplus to local residents because the commodities were earmarked for other states and localities and the paperwork required to mobilize the transfer would mean at least a 60 day delay.

With the help of Congressman Bill Boner, 5th District Tennessee, we jointly pressed federal officials in Atlanta and Washington resulting in surplus commodities being made available, although ironically not from the stockpiles in Nashville.

105 tons of butter and 105 tons of cheese were requested each month for distribution in February, April and May. Including the distribution in December 1982, over 813,900 pounds of cheese and 518,000 pounds of butter have been given to more than 140,000 households. By the end of July, Metro Government will have distributed more than 2.2 million pounds of dairy products.

By distributing one day per month at 48 different sites throughout the county, Metro Government is able to more efficiently reach the people in need.

Distribution is coordinated by the Metropolitan Development and Housing Authority with the help of volunteers from all parts of the community, including church groups, the Junior Chamber of Commerce, college organizations, businesses and individuals.

In addition, various departments within the Metro Government "Adopt" a distribution site. The Metro Civil Defense delivers to 19 non-public housing high rises for the elderly while the Metro Police Department delivers to shut-ins.

During the days of distribution, I visit the major sites in each section of the county. The lines are getting longer; the people are getting younger. Time after time, the people who came to get their cheese are people with whom I had gone to school. It is embarrassing for them and it is embarrassing for me.

As a result of witnessing this growing need for assistance, we are now in the process of trying to acquire USDA surplus dried food commodities such as corn meal, dried milk, rice and honey. Again, the Metro Development and Housing Authority is encountering delays and barriers from the other levels of government. This is indeed frustrating and it further unveils the need to modify the system.

Despite the public effort, the private effort and the combined effort to reach the needy and feed the hungry, the fact remains that economic conditions have worsened for many people and the number of persons benefitting from federal aid programs such as AFDC and food stamps continues to decrease.

Between September 1981 and November 1982 the number of households in the Nashville Metropolitan area that were eligible for the Food Stamp Program

dropped by 18 percent, from 24,139 to 19,794. The number of families receiving AFDC decreased from 7,358 to 6,185 during the same period.

In conclusion, the series of events of soup lines, food banks and surplus distributions in the last 12 months demonstrates the harsh realities of the problem which we are addressing here today.

The local communities become the focal point for the anguish of persisting hunger and therefore should be the catalyst for remedy.

The local government is held accountable and needs the flexibility to work quickly and efficiently. I have cited several instances today where the flexibility is hampered by the inflexibility of federal agencies.

It is my suggestion that a better working partnership between governments, Local, State and Federal, be developed immediately in this nation's effort to feed the hungry.

STATEMENT OF HON. ARTHUR J. HOLLAND, MAYOR, TRENTON, N.J.

Ladies and Gentlemen: My name is Arthur J. Holland, Mayor of the City of Trenton, New Jersey. I thank you for this opportunity to testify on a subject of such importance to the life of our nation and of my City. Like other urban centers in this country, Trenton contains a high percentage of residents living below the poverty level. Inflation, especially, the high cost of basic food staples, severely affects the health and welfare of Trenton's least advantaged citizens.

1. STATISTICAL BACKGROUND OF TRENTON

Information on the incidence of hunger, according to the World Hunger Education Service, can only be estimated by analyzing data from a variety of sources. One of the most reliable sources is the number of residents below the poverty level.

Out of the 92,124 residents of Trenton, approximately two percent receive General Assistance, approximately eighteen percent are Senior Citizens living on a fixed income, and approximately twenty percent are members of one-parent families and, thus, Aid-for-Dependent-Children (AFDC) recipients. Of the 19,041 families residing in the City, approximately twenty-one percent fall below the poverty level. Without some type of direct assistance, persons in the below-poverty-level category would almost certainly face daily hunger situations.

2. THE HUNGRY, AND AVAILABLE PROGRAMS

Another indicator for measuring hunger would be the number of persons assisted by emergency food programs. Currently, Trenton is served by a number of emergency programs. Public-sector programs such as Food Stamps; Women, Infants and Children Program; Public School Nutrition Program; and Summer Food Service Program enable residents to maintain a survival level. But the number of participants served or the number of meals served reflects the need for these programs. Below are statistics pertaining to the above mentioned public-sector programs:

Trenton Public Schools Nutrition Program (Meals Served): Breakfast Program. 1982—4,873; 1983—5,582. Lunch Program. 1982—1,691,600; 1983—1,372,000.

Summer Food Service Program (Lunches Served):

1982—4,025 lunches served daily (5 days per week) at 53 sites.

1983—The number of lunches is expected to increase. In addition, an estimated 1,000 breakfasts will be served.

(WIC) Women, Infants and Children Program (Monthly average of clients served):

1981—3,809 average monthly caseload.

1982—3,439 average monthly caseload.

Food Stamps (Families Served): 1982—10,659.

Government recognizes the need to feed its population adequately, but is the present standard sufficient for a City with twenty-one percent of its residents living below the poverty level? Federal funding cuts are adversely affecting the Trenton Public Schools Nutrition Program and the WIC Program. Tighter standards have eliminated many families from the Food Stamp Program. For these victims, non-profit organizations are the only source of a daily meal.

Trenton is extremely fortunate to have the Rescue Mission, Trenton Areas Soup Kitchen, Mt. Carmel Guild, Salvation Army and United Progress Incorporated.

The following figures prove that the non-profit sector is providing its fair share for Trenton's poor.

Trenton Area Soup Kitchen (Meals Served) : 1982—40,000.

Salvation Army (Emergency Food packages) : 1982—777 families and/or individuals served.

Mt. Carmel Guild (Emergency Food Packages) : 1982—2,095 families served; 5,067 individuals served.

United Progress, Inc. (Food commodities) : 1982—80,000 pounds of butter; 100 pounds of cheese.

Rescue Mission Emergency Soup Kitchen (Meals served) : 1983—1,947.

The two criteria use to measure hunger, residents below poverty level, and the number of people assisted by emergency food programs, reveal a need for expanded food programs to serve our urban poor. The Federal Government can immediately alleviate this hunger problem by making surplus food commodities available to non-profit organizations. First, Food Stamp allocations fall far short for feeding a family. Often, these families, especially at the end of the month, seek food assistance from one of the above mentioned non-profit organizations.

Trenton's non-profit organizations must purchase food from private organizations. If commodities were already available, non-profits would be able to expand program services at a cheaper operational cost.

Second, commodity programs such as the cheese and butter distributions enable the working poor to supplement their regular food purchases. The current surplus commodity program has done much to make needy Trentonians aware that they have not been totally forgotten by their government.

STATEMENT OF HON. ERNEST N. MORIAL, MAYOR, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Chairperson Mark Andrews and other members of the Rural Development, Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate:

We are honored to be speaking before you today. Thank you for listening to the concerns of America's mayors about our national agenda.

We will not need to shower you with flowery phrases or fancy rhetoric this morning in order to make our point. The facts are going to speak for themselves.

In the City of New Orleans, for example, which has a population of approximately one-half million people and a median income of $15,000, requests for emergency food assistance have increased over 200 percent to the City's food assistance referral agency in the last year.

Private agencies are also reporting dramatic increases in food demand. The New Orleans Food Bank served 8500 clients in 1981 but experienced a 67 percent increase in the number of clients requesting aid in 1982. By the end of 1983, the Food Bank expects to have served 21,000 clients, almost triple the 1981 demand.

The New Orleans Salvation Army had a 40 percent increase in demand for its emergency food program last year. Soup kitchens in New Orleans reported 20 percent service increases.

According to a survey which the New Orleans City Office of Community Services conducted this year, the three main reasons for this service demand increase are local unemployment, an increase in the number of unemployed transients coming to New Orleans from other U.S. cities, and cutbacks in federal food programs.

The point is that this nation continues to experience a higher than anticipated unemployment rate while we continue to cut the programs that benefit America's poor and unemployed. It is estimated that every one percent increase in unemployment adds 1.23 million people to the food stamp program.

In New Orleans, unemployment is continuing to increase and now hovers near 11 percent. Being an economy dependent to a considerable degree upon the depressed energy industry, our economic slump is lasting longer than the national slump. Yet, our food stamp allocation has decreased to the point where we are forced to cut back service to its 1978 levels.

Under such circumstances, how can we—the elected and appointed custodians of our national agenda—justify a federal policy which chooses to completely ignore those who lose out in the workings of our free enterprise system?

I am appealing to you that we cannot forget these victims. The budget cuts inflicted upon Food Stamps, Medicaid, Women, Infants and Children, and AFDC have gone too far.

We are eliminating the basis of support the Federal and urban governments built during the last three decades for low-income citizens.

About one-tenth of the national budget is targeted towards helping low-income citizens, and yet 25 percent of all the budget cuts have come within this 10 percent.

Moreover, sixty percent of the nation's poor—those citizens who are benefitted by these food assistance programs—live in America's cities. The budget cuts have significantly impacted our ability to address their needs. We are being extremely hard hit.

In New Orleans, for example, 10 percent of those who were once eligible for public assistance are now dropped from the rolls. Although New Orleans has the second highest infant mortality rate in the nation—an infant mortality rate higher than Jamaica or Angola—we are witnessing attempts at the Federal level to cut the Women, Infants and Children Program.

Each school year, approximately 10 million students are dependent upon breakfasts and lunches provided through the School Breakfast Program and the Child Care Feeding Program. Yet the administration proposed this year to consolidate all these programs into a general nutrition assistance block grant to the states, a block grant which comes with 27 percent fewer funds no less.

Do you know what the City of New Orleans' experience has been with the block grant programs thus far? To date, we have yet to be included in the state of Louisiana's allocation or implementation planning process despite our repeated appeals to be heard.

And we're not alone. According to a survey conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors last year, 70 percent of the cities surveyed were not fairly represented in either the state planning or state resource allocation process under the block grants.

But there's more. The Reagan Administration would like to eliminate the Summer Feeding Program altogether, a program which each year serves over 200,000 lunches and 100,000 breakfasts to low-income students.

How in these difficult times can we attack the programs that provide temporary and needed help to people? Our social and economic structure unfortunately is causing disastrous pain to some while it protects others.

Can we sit by and let unmitigated market forces operate while some of our children are unfairly condemned to begin life under circumstances that predispose them to poverty and hopelessness.

I say we cannot. I ask you to remember that when we speak of hunger in America's cities—cities like New Orleans—those are the places were the buck really stops, because that is where we find most of the people in need of food assistance. Strapped by dwindling support from state budgets and public referendums—such as Proposition 13 or Proposition 2½ in Massachusetts—city governments are ill-equipped to take on the needs of the hungry and the poor without assistance.

Our people bear the brunt of this budget-cutting fever which is focused only on human service programs, programs our cities sorely need. I remind you that we cannot afford to ignore urban needs when we formulate the National agenda. The long-term costs of short-term savings are by far greater and more dangerous than the White House is admitting.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. DIANNE FEINSTEIN, MAYOR, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

On the streets of America's cities today, we are witnessing a strange anomaly. In a nation with surplus crops which pays farmers not to grow, and with grocery shelves bulging with food, we see a growing army of hungry people.

Reasonable people must ask why, and responsible and compassionate people must work to remedy the situation.

Hunger is deeply felt by hundreds of people in my city and many cities of the United States. San Francisco's attack on hunger has many facets, some duplicated in other cities, and some independent. Let me touch on some of the most notable:

The Mayor's Task Force on the Homeless has found beds for homeless persons 154,000 times and served them an estimated 325,000 free meals in the last six months;

Our Commission on Aging provides hot lunches to many of the city's 137,000 seniors, funded through our Parking Tax, the Federal Older Americans Act and the state. This year 1,075,124 meals were provided—a third of them home-delivered. Next year, we expect to provide ten percent more—1,535,540 meals.

The San Francisco Unified School District is serving 41,000 breakfasts and lunches a day—7.3 million meals a year. But this year is different: for the first time the program is running at a deficit—because of cuts in federal reimbursements and tightened entitlements.

A summer food service for children sponsored by the Mayor's Office under the Department of Agriculture served more than 200,000 lunches last year and expects that figure to rise to 250,000 this summer. Between 4,000 and 6,000 youngsters get these meals so important to their health and growth.

The Commodities Supplemental Food Program in San Francisco is the only one in operation west of Denver. USDA funded, it provides boxes of food for pregnant and post-partum women and children under six. The 5,000 families it served last year have risen sharply to 7,000 now.

Many of us in this room have never known and do not understand true hunger, and let us hope we never will. To most Americans, hunger is that not-unpleasant feeling we get when mealtimes come around.

Real hunger is the most basic survival need people face. All else is secondary. When you give a hungry person sustenance, you also make them better able to deal with all other problems they face.

In cities, hunger has other ramifications. When people do not get food, other things often happen: anger, violence and crime. Those deprived of milk for their babies and groceries for their families soon become desperate.

Food is the bottom line for survival.

My city, I believe, was more fortunate than most when swept with a rising tide of homeless, hungry people last fall. We had a number of private, non-profit humanitarian agencies which for years have generously provided meals for the hungry.

They became the focus of the city's efforts to meet its human crisis. And they helped us deal with a second survival need, shelter, and finally a third—employment.

Let me tell you briefly the magnitude of the job just two of those humanitarian organizations are doing.

Glide Memorial Church has operated a free meals program in the heart of downtown San Francisco since 1969—providing three meals daily to general assistance clients and free evening meals to all who come. In August of 1981, Glide served 28,580 meals. The following August, in 1982, the figure had risen to 44,765.

Last fall, Glide became part of the Mayor's Task Force for the Homeless and in January served 88,500 meals to all comers.

Those numbers are eloquent testimony to hunger in America: Glide's meals for the hungry have more than tripled in 17 months.

Similarly, St. Anthony's Dining Room—which has served 15.5 million free meals since 1950—saw a sharp increase in every month of 1982. St. Anthony's has one purpose: to provide free, warm, nourishing meals to the hungry poor—with love and without restriction, every day of the year.

St. Anthony's is now serving more than 2,000 meals every day, seven days a week.

Those who spend their days at such institutions are hard-pressed to describe the people they see in food lines. They are everybody. They are men and women, young, middle aged and old, of every race and origin. They are residents and transients, domestic and foreign. They are sometimes in rags, but not always.

Increasingly, there are men in three-piece suits and women carrying briefcases. These are people looking for jobs, but without the money to feed themselves while they try.

Increasingly, those who observe this movement speak of two hidden dimensions of the hungry which are most serious and increasing most rapidly:

The senior citizens—too old to work, too proud to beg, and often too feeble to get around. These elderly people scrape together rents and money for medical needs, but find there is not enough left for adequate meals. They are out there, in increasing numbers. They don't need much, but they need it regularly.

Women—and particularly women with children. More than ever before, the free food lines fill with small children and their mothers. Glide Church estimates 27 percent of its clients are women with children. This is the sociologically-labelled "feminization of poverty"—hungry women and children.

The Food Bank, operated for two years in San Francisco by the Council of Churches, has seen a phenomenal growth in food distribution from last year to this: 20,000 pounds a month last year and 200,000 pounds a month now. This increased demand is attributed to more middle class unemployed, more mothers under assistance programs and more seniors on fixed incomes who can't afford food at retail prices.

But at a time when cities are feeling increased demand for food services, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has chosen to cut supplies.

A good example is the dairy foods distribution program. In San Francisco in March, the USDA gave San Francisco 750,000 pounds of cheddar cheese, which we distributed at 27 sites throughout the City. We saw visible evidence of the demand in areas not reached previously by food services, solid residential neighborhoods—where senior citizens came in droves for their precious pounds of cheddar cheese.

The very next month, apparently in response to lobbying against the distribution by grocery chains, USDA gave the entire state of California 750,000 pounds of cheese—the same amount San Francisco alone got the month earlier.

There is clearly a need to increase such food programs, not cut them.

This week there was a meeting of California's "Big 8" school districts. Ten items on the agenda were scrapped because one issue dominated a session of food programs: a new federal requirement that school districts verify the incomes of 3 percent of the applicants for school meal programs.

"They are trying to make policemen out of us," one administrator complained, saying entitlement verifications are already "mind boggling" and indicate there is very little cheating. The verification program amounts to a big effort for a small payoff, he said.

The new federal requirements will seriously impact the school feeding programs, our school district believes, and will frighten off families who need help but are already scared by red tape.

In fairness and while we are talking about schools, one school administrator said this year San Francisco has received a good supply of surplus commodities—declaring it "the salvation of our program" and hoping it will not be cut.

Another knowledgeable person about food in my city summed up for me the many flaws in the Department of Agriculture's practices which make it much less than effective in dealing with the nation's hunger needs:

First, the agency is too responsive to the politics of the food situation, reacting to growers and grocers and not to people.

Second, even when the department does help, it is frequently too late.

Finally, USDA tends to do things once and disappear from the scene—while the needs of the nation's hungry must be met every day until their problems are solved.

I am interested in listening to the comments of others at this hearing, and to offer this subcommittee San Francisco's assistance in focussing attention on a growing problem and finding solutions.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARION BARRY, JR., MAYOR, WASHINGTON, D.C.

It is an honor to speak to you today on a subject for which I have great commitment both as Mayor of the District of Columbia and as a concerned citizen. It is reassuring to find a friendly and sensitive ear in a time when some officials regard the problem of hunger in America as more imagined than real—when these same officials express sentiments that existing food and nutrition programs continue to meet the basic food needs of the nation's poor.

The shame and disgrace of hunger in America is apparent throughout the cities of this nation. The problem of hunger and the plight of the hungry cannot be overstated so long as people fail to acknowledge their presence, to accept responsibility for their occurrence and take the appropriate steps to eliminate them.

While I am well aware that these problems are generic to all of us here present (as we have borne witness to in testimony), as Mayor of the District I sit in

a particularly unique and often frustrating position. On the one hand I am able to observe and interact with the inner workings of this nation's great system of government. I see the debating and the discussing of issues resulting in the enactment of legislation presumably in the interest of the commonweal.

The frustration I bear is in witnessing both situations. Morally, I know I must do more, yet this fact is overshadowed by the more realistic fact of limited funds available for such purposes.

There are approximately 25,000 [1] men, women and children in the Washington metropolitan area who at anytime could face a foodless situation. These are the persons who have an income of less than 125 percent of the basic poverty level and who therefore could find themselves totally without money to purchase food in view of the enormous costs of living in Washington. (Included in this figure are the chronically homeless whose statistics are not available in census data, because such information is collected by address and census tract.) The city's problem with the federal food and nutrition programs is universal: there is greater need than resources.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The D.C. Food Stamp Program rolls have grown by 3,158 individuals over the last year despite cutbacks resulting from tighter eligibility requirements. We further anticipate that in fiscal year 1984, there will be in excess of 95,000 individuals applying for and receiving food stamp benefits. This, of course, demonstrates the need for greater food stamp assistance. However, there is still another problem: those who are able to qualify for food stamps find them inadequate to meet monthly food requirements.

One group that is particularly hard hit by this problem is the elderly poor who number approximately 14,000. With reductions in food stamp coupons based on increased Social Security benefits there may be little if any money left to supplement food purchases. Many individuals who are in this situation go without rather than seek help. With the demise of outreach, persons who are eligible for a wide range of services are lost through the cracks.

The Capitol Area Community Food Bank began operations in April 1980 supplying food to between 5,000–10,000 individuals each month through approximately 60 member agencies. Currently, the food bank is supplying food to approximately 80,000 individuals each month through 250 member organizations. In the three years of operation, the Bank has supplied nearly 3½ million pounds of food.

The demand for food continues to rise and is so great that a freeze has been placed on expanding membership until July to assure that current agency members receive enough food to meet their monthly requirement. Many of the persons who benefit from the food bank are food stamp recipients. A survey taken by the Food Research and Action Council (FRAC) of food banks and pantries around the country revealed that there are four groups of people most affected by the inadequacies and inequities of the Food Stamp Program:

(1) Those who run out of food stamps at the end of the month;

(2) Those who use the food banks during the month to stretch their food stamp benefits;

(3) Those who are experiencing delays in processing food stamp applications, or delays in when food stamps arrive; and

(4) Those with assets who can't qualify for food stamps.

Such is the case in the District. One must only witness the long lines of persons waiting for food distributed by any of the 80 member churches of the Council of Churches which have distributed in excess of two million pounds of cheese, butter, bread and other food since the program began in January, 1983, to needy persons throughout the District in the most economically deprived areas. Such distributions have served as many as 18,000 persons at any one time.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The D.C. WIC program has experienced growth in number of participants. In fiscal year 1983 the WIC program served on the average nearly 10,000 mothers, infants and children each month. This was a monthly increase of 230 over the average monthly figure for fiscal year 1982. While the caseload is obviously growing, realizing the limited resources available, we anticipate serving an average

---

[1] In the District of Columbia, there are 113,356 below the poverty line (17.9 percent of the population).

caseload of 1,100 individuals each month in fiscal year 1984. With a continually growing pool of potentially eligible individuals, one can clearly see the need for greater resources.

Similarly, the Commodity Supplemental Foods Program recognizes a growing need based on the pool of potential eligibles. However, due to federal cuts in funds, outreach efforts have been reduced to such an extent that fewer individuals receive the services provided.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

During the current school year (1982–1983) 85 percent of the children who participated in the D.C. School Lunch Program received reduced price or free lunches. Although federal funding for the program was reduced, the need was not. The program operated at this level due to the strong commitment of city officials to assure that no child in a D.C. school would go hungry during a typical school day. The City Council appropriated $11 million in District funds to enable children to receive subsidized lunches and free breakfasts.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate my deep concerns about the problem of hunger in the District of Columbia. It is my sincere hope that you will exercise your influence as a member of the Senate Budget, Appropriations and Agriculture Committees to urge your colleagues to ensure that the matter of hunger in America will be a high priority in the final decision making process. This is not simply a problem that takes place during the holidays—it is with us all each and every day any American citizen goes without proper nourishment.

I do feel confident, however, that you will continue in your efforts to push Congress to appropriate additional funds for the Food Stamp Program just as you were instrumental in doing for the child nutrition programs. It has been demonstrated that the efforts of food banks and other emergency assistance programs are heroic, but, without the necessary federal financial assistance fewer persons will be fed. Such programs cannot make up for the inadequacies created by the budget cutbacks. Increasing the funding level for food stamps will in many instances remove people from the soupline.

I petition you to lend your support to the consensus of the states that monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting be made a state opinion rather than a mandatory administrative process. This process is costly to implement, confusing and counterproductive. It causes unnecessary hardships for clients, because it computes current benefits on income received one or two months ago whether or not that income is still being received or is available. No mechanism exists to make up these shortages in food stamp benefits. This compounds the national hunger problems.

Finally, I petition you to influence your colleagues in the Senate to defer to the House version of the fiscal year 1984 Budget which restores $900 million to the Food Stamp Program.

Senator Andrews, I appreciate the opportunity to present the District of Columbia's case on the problem of Hunger in Cities and look forward to working with you to assist our cities in this regard.

Thank you very much.

STATISTICAL DATA

Figures for fiscal year 1983 are based on actual 6-month data through March, 1983, and projections through September 30, 1983. Figures for fiscal year 1984 are projections.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

[Number of individuals; fiscal years]

	1982	1983	1984
AFDC	43,579	38,175	[1] 95,100
GPA	10,134	10,429	.....
NPA	37,238	45,506	.....
Total	90,951	94,110	.....
Average monthly coupon value	$2,720,033	$4,034,606	.....

[1] Estimated applications and certifications.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

	School year, 1982–83	School year, 1983–84
Lunches served:		
Total daily average served	44,300	46,000
Subsidized or free	39,700	41,200
Breakfast: Daily average served (free)	13,200	14,000

Total funding for the program in 1982–83 was $22,300,000, $11 million of which was D.C. appropriated funds. The balance is from federal funds and monies collected from the children. The projected funding level for the 1983–84 school year is $23,700,000.

COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

[Fiscal years]

	1982	1983	1984
Average number of individuals served monthly	7,579	7,087	8,000
Average monthly ceiling	10,000	7,800	8,000
Funding:			
Federal	$2,400,000	$2,300,000	$2,000,000
District of Columbia	$1,000,000	$750,000	$750,000
WIC program:			
Average number of individuals served monthly	6,359	9,687	10,737
Funding (totally federally funded)	$1,923,010	$3,067,379	$3,349,944

Although there is no true ceiling imposed, the monthly anticipated number of participants for each year is based on many variables comprising the pool of potential eligibles.

STATEMENT OF HON. H. C. "BUD" WESSMAN, MAYOR, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure and an honor to be afforded the opportunity to present testimony regarding a topic which intertwines so many factors of American demographics—the basic need for food, America's efficient agricultural producers (of which I am very proud to note that my home state, North Dakota, is a leader—and that you, Mr. Chairman, as a native North Dakotan, serve as a prime example of the quality of agriculturalists in our country today), humanitarian concerns for the basic nutritional needs of all persons in our great country, and the recognition by you, Mr. Chairman, and your Subcommittee, that a majority of the persons living in America today are urban dwellers, and that the Department of Agriculture impacts as directly on the consumer in the city as it does on the agricultural producer. I would also state, parenthetically, that it is much to your credit, Mr. Chairman, that you would take time from your busy schedule to hold this Hearing in Denver at this particular time—being cognizant of the fact that Mayors of all of the leading Cities in these United States belong to this U.S. Conference of Mayors, and that they are here during this time to provide input to your very important Subcommittee so that you can be even more effective and efficient in your Oversight activities with the Department of Agriculture and its programs that impact so directly on the constituents of the Mayors to whom you have afforded the opportunity to provide input.

For the record, my name is H. C. "Bud" Wessman; I have the privilege of serving as Mayor, City of Grand Forks, North Dakota, a city made up of some 43,768 persons located in the heart of the Red River Valley of the North. The economy of Grand Forks is agricultural-related, with the primary industries relating to agriculture. Grand Forks is also "home" for the Grand Forks Air Force Base, and the University of North Dakota, an 11,000+ student campus located in Grand Forks, and an institution where I also have the opportunity to serve as Chairman, Department of Physical Therapy, School of Medicine. I present that bit of background for you so that you might more easily picture the setting of our small city, and so that the facts and figures which I present later will have greater significance. Basically, Grand Forks is a relatively small,

agriculturally oriented community in eastern North Dakota, located in the heart of some of the world's richest farmland.

In order to lend credence to this testimony, and to provide as factual a presentation as possible, I contacted several "helping" agencies located in the City of Grand Forks and asked, specifically, about the workings of the food distribution and nutrition programs with which each of the agencies interact. Of the eight agencies responding, four were voluntary (Mission Socorro, Grand Forks Chapter-American Red Cross, Greater Grand Forks Mission, and Greater Grand Forks Emergency Food Pantry), two were "quasi" governmental agencies—Greater Grand Forks Senior Citizens Association and the Quad County Community Action Agency. The remaining two were governmental in nature—the Grand Forks County Social Service Center, the "welfare" agency for the County and City of Grand Forks, and the Grand Forks Public School System. In addition, I reviewed the statistics from Job Services North Dakota, the state employment agency, in an effort to clarify unemployment figures. Those factors are identified in the following table.

COMPARABLE UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, APRIL 1982 TO APRIL 1983

	April 1982	March 1983	April 1983
United States	9.2	10.1	10.1
North Dakota	5.9	7.5	6.7
Grand Forks County (Grand Forks City population, 66 percent of county)	5.3	5.8	5.8

A cursory review of the above Table indicates that the North Dakota and Grand Forks unemployment rates are substantially below the national figures. It is interesting to note that Grand Forks County is significantly (.5 percent) below that of the rest of the State of North Dakota—speculation being that the agricultural nature of our geographic region lends greater stability to the employment market, and is less subject to peaks and valleys. One must hasten to point out that the unemployment rate is not necessarily related, however, to income level, but rather to the "work ethic" of the people living in that geographic region.

In reviewing the data collected from the eight service agencies, the following factors can be identified as locally pertinent to the food distribution/nutrition programs of USDA. Incidentally, in my written testimony, I have attached copies of each of the eight responses, and the appended information received from each of the respondents, to aid the Committee staff in their review of written testimony. I have chosen to excerpt the statements and concerns of the service agencies with whom I visited—in this way, I would hope that their comments, both positive and negative, might be brought into sharper focus for this Subcommittee.

FOOD STAMPS

"The Food Stamp Program is one of the best-run and most effective government programs locally."

"The Food Stamp Program, in spite of its problems and shortcomings, is one of the best programs enacted to combat hunger in America. I sincerely hope that there are no additional cutbacks in these programs. Many of those who will be hurt are too young to voice their opinions. (Meeting) their nutritional needs may decide whether they will become a burden to society or a contributing member."

"The Food Stamp Program was set up to provide protection for the poor against hunger and malnutrition. However, in the last few years, because of cutbacks in the program, hunger and malnutrition are again becoming evident."

"For many families, the only food they purchase is from food stamps. This is because they do not have 30 percent of their income left over to contribute to their own food needs. Those affected include children whose minds and bodies are still growing."

"Food Stamp regulations most adversely affect working poor and especially the single working parent."

"There are, however, some areas we feel are problematic. The first being that if two families are residing together; i.e., a son or daughter and family moves in

with the parents temporarily, one family cannot receive food stamps unless both families qualify for this program. This puts an undue amount of financial pressure on parents who try to 'help out'."

"The second area where we see problems (with Food Stamps) is with people who do not have a legal address or place of residence. For instance, a migrant family—because they have not established a residency in Grand Forks, they are not eligible to receive Food Stamps. Another such instance—is if a family is evicted—they cannot get any food assistance. One suggestion would be that with either a place of employment, the employment office (where such people are frequently listed for job opportunities), or through a required number of local references, a one-time emergency food stamp allotment could be made."

"I do have one concern about the Food Stamps. Our people do not qualify for Food Stamps. This is proper and good, since we prepare meals for them. However, if there was some way that Food Stamps could be allocated to purchase food for the Mission, it would be a great help all the way around. I understand this is not a philosophical possibility according to the guidelines of the program. Perhaps so—I could hope you could help us get this assistance. This could easily take care of the rest of our food needs."

SURPLUS COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

"There was a great increase in the use of the (Greater Grand Forks Emergency) Cupboard this past year and statistics for this year show growth."

"If the purpose (Federal Surplus Commodity Program) was that of being the sole major feeding program for each family, then we would definitely have to request more commodities. As it stands now, though, the Federal Surplus Commodities supplement Food Stamps, Senior feeding sites, etc."

"In Grand Forks, we provide approximately 50,500 congregate meals per year to the elderly—you can see with the very limited federal funds available, we rely heavily on USDA commodities plus, of course, local support."

"The main problem of the (Federal Surplus Commodity) program is the cost to operate it. Some type of reimbursement system should be set up for the agencies that are helping people in their community."

"We have attempted to make more of the Commodity Program than a give away; that is, we are arranging talks on consumer information (wills, car repair, smart shopping, and so forth) in conjunction with the distribution."

"Problems we have encountered with the Surplus Commodity Program include (1) the trucks give us no warning, it is hard to have people arrange to unload them; (2) we have gotten no money for administration of this Program for the last year: no money for buying or renting freezer space—no money for paying anyone to administer the Program; (3) cheese has been the basic commodity that we have gotten; if we could get wheat flour and/or noodles that would perhaps be more healthy than too many dairy products; (4) transportation to the outlying communities is a problem; (5) when the Program started, the indications we got from the Feds was that they just wanted the surplus gotten out with very little accountability; now we are hearing noises that they want more verifiable record-keeping—this would be impossible to do short of employing a permanent half-time person. With $10,000 program support costs, we could handle twice the amount of commodities each month—(or) a healthy tax credit for companies which offer to loan us (Commodities distribution administrators) storage facilities and freezer facilities."

"As to the Commodities Program, we do feel that the people who need these products are receiving them. On the other hand, we know of many people who are not in need of them who are also receiving them. We feel that the best way to alleviate this would be to have this Program administered through the already existing Food Stamp Office, where the financial priorities have already been established, rather than helter-skelter in many locations. This would probably be much more cost-efficient as well."

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me summarize the information that has been provided to me. In general, it would seem that those Grand Forks agencies involved with both the Food Stamp Program and the Surplus Commodity Distribution Program feel that these programs are necessary, that in no way should there be a diminution of support for these programs at the Federal level, and that, in fact, these programs could justifiably be increased in scope. There are some programmatic problems in both areas, and these would appear to be best

solved by either providing some administrative funding for those agencies which assist in the distribution of the commodities, tax credits to those companies which assist the distributors, or by centralizing both programs under one agency. One other concern, basic to many commodities distributors, is the "uncertainty" of program continuation. Or, as in the school lunch program, the late promulgation of regulations from USDA that invariably requires school systems to follow two sets of guidelines—one in August and the second in mid-year. It would also appear that increasing the variety of commodities (wheat flour, noodles, sugar, honey, potato products, other processed foods) available for distribution would also be advantageous, both from a nutritional and consumer acceptance standpoint. It is clear that there has been a tremendous outpouring of private support and funding by local voluntary and religious organizations in an attempt to meet the needs of citizens deserving of food supplies. It is equally obvious, even in a relatively low unemployment area such as North Dakota, that the private sector support can only go so far, and that programs such as the much-appreciated Food Stamp and Federal Surplus Commodity Programs are effective and efficient ways to supplement basic nutritional needs. As was stated in one of the letters that I received—"People here are not starving, but the distribution of surplus commodities gives them a lift."

In our part of the country, however, Senator, an apparent dichotomy does exist—even in our relatively rural environment, in some of the richest farmland in the world, there are people who must depend on programs such as Food Stamps and Surplus Commodity Distribution for their daily nutritional requirements. Again, as one of the individuals stated to me, "I personally do believe there are people in this area who are hungry, but for some reason are not seeking help. For instance—an older gentleman was in our office yesterday stating he "really didn't like asking for help—but his family didn't have food." We encouraged him to apply for Food Stamps, but he again stated that he was a "construction worker and had been out-of-work since last fall, but was hoping work would be available by this time—perhaps in June." He "really didn't like having to ask for a 'handout'." And so, in closing, let me restate to you my suspicions that there are needs—unmet needs, and that while your efforts and the efforts of your colleagues are to be commended as you attempt to meet the basic dietary needs for those who need nutritional assistance, it would be my personal word of encouragement to you that you continue to strive for an even higher level of effectiveness with regard to the Food Stamp and Commodities Distribution Programs, and that you use every means within your power to meet these unmet needs with the surplus commodities and funding resources available to your Committee.

Again, Senator Andrews, I personally thank you, and commend you for your foresight and wisdom in conducting this hearing in conjunction with the 51st Annual U.S. Conference of Mayors. Your presence at this Conference is appreciated, your leadership abilities are evident, and your foresight and wisdom in relating agricultural production to urban needs are positive examples for us as Mayors, and for our constituents.

Thank you.

CITY OF GRAND FORKS,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., May 25, 1983.

Memo to: "HELPING" Agencies.

I have been asked to present testimony on the effectiveness of the Federal Food Programs for Urban areas at the 1983 U.S. Conference of Mayors to be held in Denver June 11–15, 1983. The testimony will be in front of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.

I need some honest answers from you. Specifically, I need to know how well the food distribution and nutrition programs are working. Are the commodities programs working? Are the people who need commodities getting them? If not, why not. Is the food stamp program adequate? Is there enough commodities and food stamp availability in the City of Grand Forks? Are there reasons why we should receive more than we are presently receiving? Are there people in Grand Forks who are hungry because they are not receiving needed basic commodities? Answers to all these items would be of interest to me as I prepare my testimony.

I am asking for your help—enclosed are several sheets of paper and a self-addressed stamped envelope—I would ask that you get this information back to me no later than June 1, 1983.

Thanks for your help.

H. C. "BUD" WESSMAN, *Mayor.*

QUAD COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., May 27, 1983.

Hon. BUD WESSMAN,
City Hall,
Grand Forks, N. Dak.

DEAR BUD: Quad County Community Action Agency administers the Surplus Commodity Distribution program in Grand Forks and in Walsh, Nelson and Pembina Counties. Since about April 1982 we have had eight distributions at which we handed out approximately 140,000 pounds of cheese, butter, and noodles. In the four counties we serve there is a constant number of people at each distribution of about 4,000, with about 1,800 served at each distribution in Grand Forks. We understand that powdered milk is on its way and rice and honey are coming in small quantities to be distributed in September.

The general situation here as we can feel it out is this: few people are starving, but there is an increased number of people who are living at the margin; these people are cutting down on their nutritional intake (which will have long term effects rather than dramatic newsworthy short-term effects). Quite a few of the people who receive cheese are thankful for a little extra that helps them out, although at the last distribution there was some grumbling to the effect that they are getting bored with cheese (the major commodity we've been handling) and want something else. Bread and circuses. We have attempted to make more of the commodity program than a giveaway, that is, we are arranging talks on consumer information (wills, car repair, smart shopping, etc.) in conjunction with the distribution.

Problems we've encountered with the surplus commodity program:

(1) The trucks give us no warning, it's hard to have people arranged to unload them;

(2) We have gotten no money for administration of this program for the last year; a small amount is apparently coming down in a couple of months—What this means is that we have no money for trucking food from Grand Forks to the counties, no money for renting warehouse space, no money for buying or renting freezer space (as a result we have handled only one shipment of butter for our people in Grand Forks when we could have had three or four—no storage freezers), no money for paying anyone to administer the program;

(3) Cheese has been the basic commodity we've gotten: though it's a good source of protein there's a doubt in my mind as to whether its a good food for the elderly, who constitute about one-third of our recipients; if we could get wheat flour and/or noodles that would perhaps be more healthy than too many dairy products;

(4) Transportation to the outlying counties is a problem; in other towns the National Guard has occasionally helped out but we were informed by state National Guard that they could do it if there were a life threatening emergency;

(5) When the program started, the indications we got from the feds were that they just wanted to the surplus gotten out with very little accountability; now we are hearing noises that they want more verifiable record-keeping and cross checking—this would be impossible to do short of employing a permanent half-time person.

In regard to use and abuse of the program: we have carefully screened about half of the people for income levels. We feel there is some abuse of the program by those who do not need the food; we estimate 5 percent, maybe 10 percent, of the people might not need it, or are duplicating (some husbands and wives we have caught coming in separately), but basically we feel the people who get the cheese are the "deserving poor" and lower middle class, elderly on social security, unemployed, women heads of household with two and three children, etc. For your information, we have established 150 percent of federal poverty level with no asset test as our income guidelines. The feds have set no policy so the Community Action Agencies set their own. This is $7,290 for a family of 1, $14,850 for a family of 4, and $2,520 for each additional family member. We have had some complaint from senior citizens that they were entitled to surplus commodities regardless of income since they had worked hard and paid taxes all their lives, but we chose to argue that the distribution should be based on current need as measured by income rather than by past history.

To sum up: People here are not starving, but the distribution of surplus commodities gives them a lift. We need freezer space if we are to handle butter or any perishables. We need transportation if we are to get the food to our other

counties. We need warehouse space if we are to continue to handle the quantities being discussed. To get these we either need considerable more administrative money to a healthy tax credit for companies which offer to loan us storage facilities and freezer facilities. We could use a greater variety of food, including those which are nutritionally beneficial to the elderly. Without some administrative or program dollars we cannot handle very much more than we are now handling. With $10,000 program support costs we could handle twice the amount of commodities every month. That would be about the limit of the need in Grand Forks.

Sincerely,

ELIOT GLASSHEIM, *Executive Director.*

Enclosure.

PRELIMINARY SUMMARY OF FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM RESULTS FOR FEBRUARY 1983

	February 1982	January 1983	February 1983
The food stamp program: [1]			
People participating this month (millions)	20.5	22.1	22.2
Value of bonus coupons (millions)	$811.8	$958.6	$965.7
Average bonus per person	$39.56	$43.47	$43.54
Food distribution to needy families:			
Number of projects in operation	80	75	75
People participating this month (thousands)	90.5	94.2	91.0
Special supplemental food program (WIC):			
People participating this month (millions)	2.1	2.4	2.4
Federal food costs (millions)	$60.7	$72.5	$71.8
Commodity supplemental food program:			
People participating this month (thousands)	120.4	145.7	141.5
Federal cost (millions)	$1.9	$1.9	$1.9
Child care food program:			
Number of outlets taking part	68,200	NA	NA
Children participating (thousands)	883	NA	NA
Federal cost (millions)	$28.2	$31.5	$31.3
National school lunch program:			
Number of schools taking part [2]	91,162	90,478	90,478
Children participating this month (millions)	23.1	23.2	23.3
Children reached with free or reduced-price lunches this month (millions)	11.6	11.9	12.0
Percentage of lunches served free	42.9	43.8	44.8
Percentage of lunches served at reduced price	7.3	6.9	7.1
School breakfast program:			
Number of schools taking part [2]	34,352	32,745	32,745
Children participating this month (millions)	3.3	3.3	3.4
Percentage of breakfasts served free or at reduced-price	89.2	89.9	90.1

[1] Puerto Rico has been excluded from all months.
[2] Data collected annually (month of October).

NA.—Not available. Data reported quarterly.

Memo to: W. C. "Bud" Wessman, Mayor.
From: Martha Torkelson, Executive Director, Greater Grand Forks Senior Citizens Association.

In response to your letter dated May 25, 1983.

Under title III of the Older Americans Act, the Department of Agriculture reimburses States for either providing congregate or home delivered meals to senior citizens at a rate of 54.25 cents per meal.

In Grand Forks we provide approximately 50,500 congregate meals per year to the elderly therefore the commodity food value for our project is approximatly $27,396. You can see with the very limited federal funds available we rely heavily on USDA Commodities plus of course local support.

We receive all our commodities through the Department of Public Instruction Food Distribution Division in Bismarck. The quality of the commodity food is excellent. We are able to use almost any commodity food that is offered.

We are required to:

1. Assure appropriate and cost effective arrangements for the transportation, storage and use of USDA Donated Foods.

2. Maintain an acceptable form of inventory of the USDA Donated Foods on hand, and as they are used.

3. Contact the State Distribution Agency as soon as it is detected that USDA Donated Foods are lost due to theft, damage, spoilage, infestation or contamination.

Is there enough Commodities and food stamps available in the city of Grand Forks? I believe both programs are adequate. They were meant to supplement and I believe this is working well for the elderly. This of course is the group I am involved with.

USDA FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The nutrition services provider must assist program participants in taking advantage of benefits available under the Food Stamp Program.

The service provider must apply for authorization to accept Food Stamps at the nearest Field Office of the Food and Nutrition Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Food stamps may be used at congregate nutrition sites in lieu of cash by participants eligible to purchase the Food Stamps.

The service provider must assure that all provisions relating to the use and handling of food stamps as prescribed by federal, state, and local agencies responsible for administering the food stamp program are met.

If you have questions I may be able to answer, please call.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, FOOD DISTRIBUTION DIVISION: REPORT OF USDA DONATED FOODS RECEIVED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1982–1983, GRAND FORKS NUTRITION PROGRAM

[Participation—185]

Code—Commodity name:	Reporting unit	Amt. received	Unit value	Total value
3254—Grapefruit juice:	12/46-oz. can	40	$7.82	$312.80
3231—Pears, cd:	6/#10 cans	40	13.31	532.40
3234—Peaches, cd:	6/#10 cans	40	12.52	500.80
3434—Raisins:	30# bags		17.68	
3092—Beef cd:	24/29-oz. cans		70.47	
4045—Cheese, processed:	6/5# loaves	25	44.10	1,102.50
4074—Flour, all purpose:	5/10# bags	11	3.80	41.80
4111—Peanut butter:	6/#10 cans	11	28.40	312.40
4028—Butter print:	36/1# prints	50	56.16	2,809.00
4184—Shortening:	12/3# cans	7	15.25	100.75
3016—Beef, frozen ground:	55 lb. cartons	20	64.70	1,294.00
1456—Chicken, cut up:	40# cases	60	21.69	1,301.40
3011—Applesuace, cd:	6/#10 cans	15	10.53	157.95
3186—Mixed fruit:	6/#10 cans	35	13.54	473.90
3283—Peas, cd:	6/#10 cans	40	9.99	399.60
4173—Vegetable oil:	6/1-gal.	3	19.05	57.15
3403—Potatoes, sweet syrup:	6/#10 cans	5	14.07	70.35
3286—Prunes, dry pitted:	25 lb. bags	50	18.75	937.50
4052—Honey:	6/5# can	36	21.00	756.00
Total				11,165.30

Note: Warehouse charges—$176.14.

AMERICAN RED CROSS,
GRAND FORKS AREA CHAPTER,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., May 27, 1983.

Re your letter of May 25th.

Hon. H. C. WESSMAN,
Mayor, City of Grand Forks,
Grand Forks, N. Dak.

DEAR MR. WESSMAN: The Grand Forks Area Chapter of the American Red Cross acts as the referral agency for the Greater Grand Forks Emergency Food Cupboard which was organized by the Ministerial Association of Grand Forks. This Cupboard provides food on a short time basis.

There was a great increase in the use of the Cupboard this past year and statistics for this year show growth. I have enclosed a copy of last year's report and also the regulations for help from the Cupboard.

Those churches and agencies, who refer people, do some screening and, where the need is evident, encourage people to request food stamps.

I personally, do believe there are people in this area that are hungry but for some reason are not seeking help. For instance—an older gentleman was in our

office yesterday stating he, "really didn't like asking for help—but his family didn't have food." We encouraged him to apply for food stamps but he again stated he "was a construction worker and had been out of work since last fall but was hoping work would be available by this time—perhaps in June." He "really didn't like having to ask for a 'hand-out'."

I hope this will be of some help in the information you are looking for. If you need more information, please feel free to call our office or the Rev. Norman Neumann at Wesley Methodist Church where the Cupboard is located.

This is not a Federal food program. Food is given by individuals, churches, etc.

Sincerely,

LUVERNE H. JENSEN, *Chapter Executive.*

AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
GRAND FORKS AREA CHAPTER,
Grand Forks, N. Dak.

The American Red Cross, Grand Forks Area Chapter, provides the following services to the people in the communities; including the Grand Forks Air Force Base:

Provides: Referral service for the Greater Grand Forks Emergency Food Cupboard, keeps all records and makes monthly report to the Cupboard Board.

Regulations for the Cupboard's services are as follows:

Calls must be from Agencies or a Minister or someone with professional background.

Calls must be received before 2:30 PM to be filled same day.

Calls received after 2:30 PM will be filled the next day.

Baskets will be ready for pick up not later than 3:30 PM at 1600 4th Ave. No. (Back parking lot door of Wesley Methodist Church.)

Three orders is the limit for one family and only 1 week at a time. This not too strictly adhered to.

Submitted by,

LUVERNE H. JENSEN, *Chapter Executive.*

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., *June 2, 1983.*

Mayor BUD WESSMAN,
Grand Forks, N. Dak.

DEAR BUD: This is in reply to your request for our input into the food programs in Grand Forks.

The food stamp program, from our contact and experience, is one of the best-run and most effective government programs locally. For the most part, the people who are employed there are courteous and helpful. We feel that an honest effort is put forth to handle as many people as quickly and effectively as possible. We have noted that with the new director at the Social Service office, it is much easier to obtain a prompt (reasonably) appointment for food stamp certification than previously. In the past, we have known of many cases where a waiting period has been up to a month. Currently, it is running under one week in many cases.

There are, however, some areas which we feel are problematic. The first being that if two families are residing together, i.e., a son or daughter and family moves in with the parents temporarily, one family cannot receive food stamps unless both families qualify for this program. This puts an undue amount of financial pressure on parents who try to help out.

The second area where we see problems is with people who do not have a legal address or place of residence. For instance, a migrant family does not have the wherewithall to rent housing is often forced to live in a camper, tent, or van. Because they have not established a residency in Grand Forks, they are not eligible to receive food stamps. Does it follow that if you are not "living" here, you do not need to eat or feed your family? Another such instance which does occur all too often is if a family is evicted, and temporarily without housing they cannot get any food assistance. This often leads to lying in many cases where it would not ordinarily be done. If such a person can use a friend's address and in that way obtain the necesary help to feed his family, he feels he has no other choice. We do not, unfortunately, have a simple solution. One suggestion would be that with either a place of employment, the employment office (where such people are frequently listed for job opportunities), or through a required number of local references, a one-time emergency food stamp allotment could be made.

As to the commodities program, we do feel that the people who do need these products are receiving them. On the other hand, we know of many people who

are not in need of them who also receive them. We feel that the best way to alleviate this would be to have this program administered through the already existing food stamp office, where the financial priorities have already been established, rather than helter skelter in many locations. This would probably be much more cost-efficient as well.

We hope this will be of help to you.

Sincerely,

IVAN H. SMITH, *Director, Mission Socorro.*

GREATER GRAND FORKS MISSION
SERVICE CENTER,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., June 2, 1983.

Mayor H. C. "BUD" WESSMAN,
Grand Forks, N. Dak.

DEAR MAYOR WESSMAN: I am sorry I could not get this information back to you by June 1, but I was on vacation the last two weeks of May. I hope my response may be beneficial anyway.

We are satisfied and very appreciative of the commodities program. We have received sufficient amounts and we are doing all we can to see that none go hungry. We do feed more people than those who live at the Mission. Several families who live in our community have come to eat with us when they have been without food. It appears to me that most people have some access through some of our local programs in the area to meet their food needs.

I do have one concern about the food stamps. Our people do not qualify for food stamps. That is proper and good, since we prepare meals for them. However, if there was some way that food stamps could be allocated to purchase food for the Mission, it would be a great help all the way around. I understand this is not a philosophical possibility according to the guidelines of the program. Perhaps so, yet some of the men tell me of places where they have stayed where they are getting the food stamps. I could hope you could help us get this assistance. This could easily take care of the rest of our food needs.

For the Least, the Last, and the Lost.

DWAIN STEINKUEHLER, *Director/Chaplain.*

QUAD COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., May 31, 1983.

DEAR MAYOR WESSMAN: This letter is in reply to your May 25th memo requesting information on food programs in the Greater Grand Forks area.

Quad County has been involved with the federal surplus commodity program for more than a year. In addition, I serve as the Chairperson for the Greater Grand Forks Emergency Food Pantry. These are basically two distinct programs and I will address your questions concerning each program separately.

The federal surplus commodity program in this country is using community action agencies as the outreach and distribution component of the operation.

Since the beginning of the program last year, Quad County has distributed approximately 110,000 pounds of commodities including cheese, butter, powdered milk, and noodles. The program is currently on hold for the summer but will continue again this fall throughout the state.

Up to this point, Quad County has received an adequate amount of commodities for the low-income people in the four counties that the agency serves (Pembina, Walsh, Nelson, Grand Forks). The purpose of the program is to have it act as a supplement to other feeding programs. If the purpose was that of being the sole or major feeding program for each family, then we would definitely have to request more commodities. As it stands now though, the federal surplus commodities supplement food stamps, senior feeding sites, etc.

The people that have received commodities have liked the program and have commented that the food they receive has been of good quality.

The main problem of the program is the cost to operate it. We receive absolutely no funding for any part of the program. All of the transportation from Grand Forks to the other counties, all of the time and paperwork, and all planning come out of the agency's own budget. It has been a very time consuming project. Some type of reimbursement system should be set up for the agencies that are helping people in their communities.

The Greater Grand Forks Emergency Food Pantry has helped close to 1,000 families since it began in 1977. The pantry serves the Grand Forks Air Force

Base and East Grand Forks as well as Grand Forks. For the past year the number of people needing help has increased dramatically and the pantry has been able to meet those needs thanks mainly to the continuous contributions on the part of several churches, businesses, and individuals throughout the area.

The pantry is averaging about one (1) request for help per day. So far we have been able to meet all requests and still have a fair amount of savings untouched. Each summer, however, the savings go down and thus each fall a fund raising drive is conducted. Each time this has happened the community has responded tremendously. The pantry is totally a volunteer effort with several people donating their time to help operate the project. All referrals come from community agencies and/or churches and food is stored at the Wesley United Methodist Church.

I am enclosing a copy of the annual report for 1982 for the Emergency Food Cupboard.

If I can be of any further help please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

KENT KEYS, *Quad County.*

JANUARY 31, 1983.

ANNUAL REPORT

1982 was an unusual year for the Emergency Food Cupboard! The average number of families we have assisted each year since 1977 is just over 138. In 1982 we assisted 230 families! The average number of persons in these families for the five year span, 1977–81 was 433. In 1982 we helped 756 persons! Of these 756 persons, 388 were adults and 368 children. The months of August and December had the largest number of requests, 27 and 30. (In every other year we have averaged 12 requests per month. In 1982 we averaged over 19).

In 1981 there were 15 agencies or churches which recommended persons or families to us for assistance. In 1982 the number of agencies or churches which asked for our help rose to 28. Most of that increase came from churches and pastors.

The response of the people of the Greater Grand Forks area in making contributions of food and money has equalled the increase in needs. The largest single monetary donation came from the chapels at the Grand Forks Air Force base. Significant contributions or surplus government cheese and dried milk, plus instant potatoes from the Pillsbury Company, were a great boost to the variety of foods available through the cupboard.

Officers of the voluntary board of the Cupboard for 1983 are Chairperson: Kent Keys, Vice Chairperson: Marge Rykken, and Secretary-Treasurer: Judy McCutchan. Grocers: (those who fill the orders and stock the shelves) Harry and Margaret Severson, Kenton Hesketh and the staff of Wesley Church.

Thank you to all who have shared in the work of the "people-to-people" project.

NORMAN C. NEUMANN, *Wesley Church.*

GREATER GRAND FORKS EMERGENCY FOOD CUPBOARD STATISTICS, 1982

Month	Requests	Adults	Children	Total helped	1983 total
January	17	29	29	58	57
February	16	23	15	36	101
March	18	31	27	58	151
April	18	28	28	56	71
May	12	20	20	40	0
June	10	22	19	41	0
July	23	35	41	76	0
August	27	52	43	95	0
September	21	33	47	80	0
October	17	27	29	56	0
November	21	33	26	59	0
December	30	55	44	99	0
1982 total	230	388	368	756	0
1981 total	143	232	223	455	0
1980 total	143	219	201	420	0
1979 total	139	240	214	454	0
1978 total	132	191	219	410	0
1977 total	134	215	215	430	0

1982 referrals were made by—	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
GFAFB American Red Cross	....	....	3	1	2	3	9	10	6	3	4	11	52
Grand Forks Social Services	4	2	2	4	5	....	6	4	3	4	6	5	45
Sacred Heart Church	6	1	1	3	4	2	2	4	3	3	3	1	33
Minn. Migrant Council	1	6	3	3	....	....	....	1	1	....	2	4	21
Quad County	2	4	2	2	....	....	3	1	....	3	1	1	19
American Red Cross	1	1	1	....	....	2	1	1	....	1	1	1	10
Augustana Lutheran Church	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	1	4	....	....	2	8
Wesley U.M. Church	....	1	....	1	....	1	....	2	....	....	....	....	5
N.D. Rural Dev. Corp	1	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	1	....	....	....	3
Grand Forks City Mission	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	1	1	....	3
Broken Arrow/DANA	....	....	4	2	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	6
Calvary Lutheran Church	2	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	2
St. Michaels Church	....	1	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	2
Polk County Soc. Ser	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	2
Sharon Lutheran Church	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	1	....	....	2
Holy Family Church	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	1	....	....	2
Friend	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	2	2
WIC	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	2	2
Tri-Valley Opportunity	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	1
Home Health Care	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	1
Legal Aid	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	1
Salvation Army	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	1
Our Savior's Luth. Church	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	1
First Presbyterian Church	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	1
Walle Lutheran Church	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	1
Adult Abuse Center	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	1
Faith Baptist Church	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	1
Children's Village	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	1

GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
CENTRAL FOOD SERVICE,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., June 6, 1983.

H. C. WESSMAN,
Mayor, City of Grand Forks, Grand Forks, N. Dak.

DEAR MR. WESSMAN: The Food and nutrition programs seem to be working well for the Grand Forks Public School system—if your question is of School lunch. Student participation is one way of evaluating the program. The following shows the participation for the past two years.

	1981–82	*1982–83*
Enrollment	8,386	8,410
Daily participation	4,527	4,695

Participation in 82–83 was up 168 meals per day. We feel this is due to the addition of Salad bars at the Jr.-Sr. High level.

All of the news items claim a great reduction in commodities to school lunch when in fact we have received very usable and good quality commodities the past two years. A great deal are protein items which are the most costly items in school lunch. I am enclosing the total amount of commodities received in the past two years for your comparison.

In 1983 we had 1,118 students eligible for free meals and 639 students eligible for reduced meals. These meals are available to those people who fit these guidelines.

I am not qualified to answer questions on food stamps or commodities distributed to the poor.

If I can be of further help feel free to call.

Sincerely,

LAURA JANE PAULSON, *Cafeteria Director.*

Enclosure: Commodity reports.

FOOD DISTRIBUTION DIVISION: REPORT OF USDA DONATED FOODS RECEIVED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1981–82, GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOL

[Participation—4,515]

Code—Commodity name:	Reporting unit	Amount received	Unit value	Total value
3425—Tomatoes, cd:	6/#10 cans	95	$10.59	$1,006.05
4094—Flour, BHW:	50# bags	60	8.17	490.20
4189—Spaghetti:	20# cases	95	5.14	488.30
4040—Cheese proc:	6/5# loaves	479	62.92	[1] 25,348.68
4020—Butter, print:	32/1-lb. prints	80	59.90	[1] 4,792.00
3080—Beef, frozen ground:	55 lb. cartons	544	85.80	15,202.08
6030—Chicken, cut up:	30# box	621	24.48	15,202.08
3297—Pineapple, cd:	6/#10 cans	52	15.90	826.80
3430—Tomato paste:	6/#10 cans	200	16.51	3,302.00
3004—Apple juice:	12/#3 cans	-----	10.57	0
3405—Potatoes, sweet syrup:	6/#10 cans	-----	14.80	0
3315—Pork, cd:	24/29-oz. cans	-----	63.70	0
4025—Butter, print:	36/1-oz. cases	190	67.39	[1] 12,804.10
3440—Turkey, whole	40# cartons	114	34.08	3,885.12
3005—Apricots:	6/#10 cans	73	22.41	1,635.93
3075—Beans, green:	6/#10 cans	153	9.70	1,484.10
4170—Salad oil:	6/1-gal.	88	23.28	2,048.64
3340—Plums, cd:	6/#10 cans	-----	11.61	0
3232—Peaches, cd:	6/#10 cans	245	15.98	3,915.10
3010—Applesuace:	6/#10 cans	265	12.63	3,346.95
3280—Pears:	6/#10 cans	180	15.93	2,867.40
3406—Prunes, dried:	25-lb. bags	80	22.50	1,800.00
3295—Peas:	6/#10 cans	69	11.60	800.40
3310—Pork, frozen ground:	55# cartons	78	76.14	5,938.92
3441—Turkey roast:	4/8X12# roasts	179	55.20	9,880.80
3433—Raisins:	30# bags	20	21.20	424.00
3066—Beans, vegetarian:	6/#10 cans	112	10.51	1,177.12
3185—Mixed fruit:	6/#10 cans	112	18.26	2,045.12
4101—Macaroni:	20# bags	24	6.56	157.44
3414—Tator rounds:	6/5# cases	112	11.17	1,251.04
4078—Flour, all purpose:	5/10# bags	10	7.76	77.60
Total				153,671.09
[1] Would be bonus items (the 3 total $42,944.78 bonus)				42,944.78
Total				110,726.31
76,922 lbs. of flour to Interstate Brands Corp. at $0.1138/lb				8,754.00
The 11½¢/child commodity value				119,480.31

Note: Warehouse charges—$1,647.18.

REPORT OF USDA DONATED FOODS RECEIVED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1982–83, GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOL

[Participation—4,714]

Code—Commodity name:	Reporting unit	Amount received	Unit value	Total value
3232—Peaches, cd:	6/#10 cans	510	$16.23	$8,277.30
4040—Cheese, processed:	6/5# loaves	400	52.92	21,168.00
4094—Flour, bmv:	50# bags	4	8.17	367.65
4170—Salad oil:	6/1-gal.	205	19.37	3,970.85
4180—Shortening:	12/3# cans	40	18.30	732.00
3051—Beans, kidney, cd:	6/10# cans	100	11.40	1,140.00
3440—Turkey, whole:	40# cartons	379	25.95	9,835.05
4041—Cheese, mozzarella:	8/6# loaves	25	80.06	2,001.50
3030—Beef, frozen ground:	55-lb cartons	405	77.64	31,444.20
3115—Chicken patties:	40# cases	102	59.69	6,088.36
3431—Turkey roast:	4/8-12# roasts	83	56.12	4,057.98
3260—Pears, cd:	6/#10 cans	336	15.97	5,365.92
3295—Peas, cd:	6/#10 cans	114	13.64	1,554.96
4189—Spaghetti:	20# cases	134	5.14	688.76
4025—Butter, print:	36/1-lb. cases	160	67.39	10,782.40
4154—Rice:	25# bags	49	6.21	304.29
3002—Apples, fresh:	37# boxes	100	12.48	1,248.00
4043—Cheddar cheese:	40# blocks	21	69.60	1,461.60
4050—Honey:	6/5# cans	20	25.20	504.00
3075—Beans, green cd:	6/#10 cans	110	9.70	1,067.00
3135—Mixed fruit:	6/#10 cans	185	16.25	3,006.25
3113—Chicken, cut up:	40# cases	306	25.64	7,845.84
3414—Tator rounds:	6/50 cases	237	10.70	2,535.90
3131—Grapefruit juice:	12/46-oz. can	40	10.94	437.60
3297—Pineapple tidbits:	6/#10 cans	111	18.17	2,016.87
4101—Macaroni:	20# bags	36	6.56	196.90
3119—Chicken thighs/drums	10# cases	103	26.10	2,688.30
3350—Potatoes, crinkle, frozen:	30# cases	325	9.64	3,133.00
3045—Beans, dry pinto:	25# bags	-----	7.50	0
3010—Applesauce:	6/#10 cans	148	12.63	1,869.24
3066—Beans vegetarian:	6/#10 cans	111	12.12	1,345.32
Total				137,734.94

Note: Warehouse changes—$1,647.18.

STATEMENT OF ALICE R. STARK, DIRECTOR, CENTRAL DENVER COMMUNITY SERVICE, DENVER, COLO.

The role of a mayor in the lives of his or her constituents is the most politically intimate. Most Americans have a hard time naming their Senators or Congressmen but everybody knows who the mayor is. The word mayor is a doublet of the word major, both come from the Latin *magnus*. The words were a comparative and they mean the greatest. Cities evolved as persons came together outside of fortresses and cathedrals for protection and to enhance commerce. The leaders of those people were originally the best fighters and the strongest. They held their post until someone stronger or tougher took it from them. We have modified that process now but in many ways the results don't differ. The mayor is still the most visible and closest officeholder to the largest number of citizens. The high visibility is demonstrated by the antiquity of the old saw, "You can't fight City Hall." (I do, all the time.)

One can fight City Hall or engage in any other fight because one feels a moral imperative to protest, to fight. Or, if one is an adroit politician, one can fight only when there is a reasonable certainty of winning. "City Hall" is, in actuality, a symbol for entrenched power that has become the target for hostility that rises from the fact that an operant mode of thinking often enthroned in a city hall is the historic notion of "us" and "them." The "us" is those of us gathered here today to talk about the problems of the "them" and the problems "they" are causing (largely by merely being alive). The "us" are the bright, the clever the wealthy, the powerful. The "them" are those who are not powerful and who, in many ways, are considered disposable. The "them and us" notion is so firmly in place that its validity is seldom questioned by anyone, even the "them". If it is questioned by the powerless, the response is a shrug and the observation that, "You can't fight City Hall."

The "them" and "us" concept is, however, fallacious. The truth, the reality is that the "them" are us, too . . . we, too, are the "they." Their problems and gifts are ours and ours are theirs. A simple demonstration might be the plight of one mayor of one small city as he faces the Leviathan of the Federal Government. It is only as he joins with another mayor and another and another until there is a United States Conference of Mayors that anything like a peer relationship develops. If we here today are collectively "city hall" then I would urge us to do something like "fight the Pentagon."

The attempts to impose the so-called "new Federalism" have faltered but there is still an enormous amount of energy rallying to force you to take care of yours. It is virtually impossible for municipalities or states to identify and limit responsibility for designated populations and it is equally impossible for the private sector. 500,000 sacks of groceries do not—can not—compensate for the loss of $5 million dollars in food stamps.

In 1982, our agency restricted its assistance to persons who had lived in Denver for 90 days or more and we served over 31,000 people. If we had the resources we could have served double or even triple that number. We distributed about 50 tons of food, almost a ton a week. Interestingly enough, about 60% of those defined as resident by the ninety day rule had lived in Denver less than seven years. Our mayor was often heard, publically, making reference to "those people who come here expecting . . ." Simultaneously, however, Denver was laying out the welcome mat for new business and industry. Denver is a target city for new capital, equalled only by Dallas-Fort Worth in petroleum dollars. The mayor was never upset about those people. The boom dollars, however, trail after them the dollarless populations. The huge megalopili of the east see out-migration and cities such as Denver experience an in-migration. Trying to establish "ownership" or responsibility for such a population is not possible and cities should not be forced to attempt such a task.

Emma Lazarus' poem on the Statue of Liberty invited the poor, the wretched, the huddled masses not only to our shores but to every city in the country . . . and the invitation still stands. Attempts to shift responsibility to city-state governments or to the private sector will, if successful, only serve to diffuse and render ineffective and irrational, efforts to feed the hungry.

The principal source of food for the poor is the USDA Food Stamp program. Whatever equity characteristics the food stamp program resides in the fact that there is no residency requirement. A displaced steel worker from Pennsylvania can collect food stamps in Denver the week he arrives.

Five years ago, when those of us in the private sector criticized the amount of stamps being given, we were told that the program was not intended to provide

for all the food needs of a household but only as a supplement. Now there are 1000's and 1000's of people whose only form of income is food stamps—$75 a month. There are thousands more who need stamps but who have been cut off from the program or had the amount of stamps awarded drastically reduced. The urban poor cannot keep a few chickens and a cow. Their resources are dumpsters in back of restaurants and supermarkets. For those so inclined, it is fun to poke a finger at the present administration and blame all our social ills on Mr. Reagan. But that again is the "them and us" mentality and is again fallacious.

Sociologists and futurists have been talking for years about the accelerated pace of change and we have all nodded and been moderately worried about the quality of life our grandchildren might enjoy. Well, that remote "then", is now. In his book, "Megatrends," John Naisbitt asserts that we are living in an age of parenthesis between the Industrial Society and the Information Society. Seventy five years ago a wealthy family had a radio placed in a prominent place in the parlor. Today, we have computers talking to each other. Much of what we describe as "recession" is, in fact, "progression", the beginning of a new era. Large numbers of persons out of work now will never go back to their old occupations and many may never be gainfully employed again. Add to that population the numbers of young people filling our cities, who have never had any skills, who have never held a job for more than a few weeks. Ten years ago, twenty years ago, fifty years ago, they could eke out a living by doing odd jobs, washing dishes or cars, shovelling snow or cutting lawns. Now they do not have the skills to build car washes, dishwashers, snow blowers or lawn mowers. Now they are living on the edge of survival, hungry, homeless, frightened and angry.

The transition for all of us is traumatic and that trauma is exacerbated by the fact that we were largely unprepared and are largely unwilling to admit its very existence. We cling to our old ways of responding but we are responding to problems with which we have never dealt before. The so-called "new poor" are not going to go away and the likelihood of their being integrated or reabsorbed into the mainstream or into the labor market is slim. The number of persons needing subsidy for food, fuel, shelter and medical attention is going to grow and grow. "They" are going to be a larger and larger proportion of the population. Perhaps, even your grandchildren will be part of "them." And, if they get just a little more information and a little smarter, "they" are going to be a political force of significance. "Those" people and "their" problems cannot be handled piecemeal with differences from city to city or region to region. Simple logic mitigates against that approach. The poorest cities are the cities with the largest number of poor within them. The affluent cities are the cities with the largest number of affluent people within them. Thus, the cities with the greatest level of need are the cities with the least amount of resources. Federal efforts to require poor cities to take care of their own is only an expanded variation of the old pulling onself up by the bookstraps. One safe prediction is that the poor feeling trapped in poor cities are going to gravitate to affluent cities. The boom cities of the Sun Belt and the southwest are already experiencing "tent cities" and all the other problems attendant with an influx of poor folk and a slum in Dallas is not quantitatively or qualitatively different than a slum in Chicago or Detroit.

There is no evidence that the poor move across the country to gain a few dollars a month more in welfare benefits. The truth is that across the board, in this country, welfare benefits, food stamps and other supplementary food programs are so meager, so inadequate that the poor are burdened with a despondency and ennui that forces them to run . . . not necessarily to anything but away from bleakness and despair. They move because they are miserable and unhappy and because life is almost unbearable. Their reasons for moving are profound beyond those which can be ameliorated by $16 a month more in welfare benefits. They seek a geographic answer to a social and psychological dilemma.

It was observed before that we are moving into an age of Information exchange. The urban poor are not excluded from those transactions. The upsurge of black militanacy in this country owes some measure of its success to the United States Selective Service System. A young black man from a poor parish in Louisiana met a young black man from Los Angeles and they made friends with a young black man from Detroit. When they went home from war, they found the same bleak aspect that they had left and they could pick up a telephone and they could talk to each other. The young man in Watts could see, on the television, his brother-in-arms dying in Selma, Alabama. The poor are becoming politically astute. Elections in Chicago and Philadelphia are just the beginning.

As the poor and oppressed lay aside their own old biases and prejudices and realize that old enmities, old categories of "them" and "us" that used to separate black from Hispanic or "sharecropper" from black are meaningless in the face of the bond of poverty that inexorably links them together, they will be a contentious force. And, as their ranks swell, ours will diminish. One of the candidates for mayor here in Denver is a Mexican-American with a tilde in his name. Ten years ago when he started his political career no one was surprised that he wanted to represent "his" people and that "they" wanted one of their own. He won the largest plurality in the initial race and I don't think even the bookmakers will give either candidate good odds. He may very well be the next mayor of Denver.

The old thinking politically and nationally has been demonstrated by its linking together as unimportant the needs of the poor along with reduced spending on sewers. We have not yet experienced the violence of the '60's which was confined to racial issues but was certainly given impetus by indifference to the problems of hunger and poverty. Historically, our urban societies have dealt with the poor by segregating and containing them, keeping them out of the sight of their more affluent neighbors. "They" are no longer staying in "their" place. One reason is that we have turned "their" place into expensive condominiums and "they" have outgrown the few patches left to "them." "They" are now joined by the "new poor."

The "new poor" are just that. They don't know that as poor people they are supposed to be quiescent and uncomplaining. They don't tip their caps and step off the sidewalk to let important folks walk unobstructed. They don't know how to be poor and they don't want to learn. They take seriously the notion that food stamps or ADC programs are defined as entitlement programs. They feel that enough to eat, a decent place to live and adequate medical care are not merely options of charity but obligations of just government. Outbreaks of violence on the part of the poor could be a tactical error because one of the most expeditious means of handling the problems "they" cause is genocide. Violence would call for violence and we could commission the National Guard to shoot looters and arsonists on sight. We could thin out the ranks and cull out the trouble makers quickly. We could leave then a population more frightened and intimidated than the genetic poor have been in the past. Such action would, of course, raise the ire of meliorists who would reject outright genocide.

Sadly, many of those same people are unaware of the fact that our national programs are slow genocide. These are the same persons whose response to hunger in their cities is a can of tuna fish and think that surplus cheese for senior citizens can replace a viable food program for women, infants and children (WIC.)

As mayors you are the closest target for every collective response in the electorate but, in many ways, that also makes you the most powerful. You don't perform some mysterious function thousands of miles from home. Fiorella La Guardia read the comic strips to the children of New York during a strike. You can start reading, to your people, the horror strips. You can educate your constituency to support you in your efforts to alleviate hunger and you can teach your people that the only solution is through effective, equitable federal food programs. You can teach your people that soup kitchens and church pantries cannot fill the need and that they are, in fact, an outrage. You have the expertise to fight and win. I, and others like me, only have the conviction that we must fight. Explain to your people that the child who dies is their child and that no city is an island.

STATEMENT OF LYNN PENNETTA, COORDINATOR, COMMUNITY FOOD AND NUTRITION PROGRAM, DENVER OPPORTUNITY, INC., DENVER, COLO.

For human service programs, the 1980's have been a period of unprecedented regrouping and retrenching, particularly in the area of non-entitlement, direct service activities. Even so, during this chaotic period innovative strategies have emerged to combat the problems of hunger and malnutrition.

Over the years, the undergirding of food and nutrition efforts has been the Food Stamp Program and On-Site Feeding activities. Yet these efforts, albeit warranted, frequently fail to reach a significant portion of the needy population. Specifically, border-line poverty, working poor or job-seeking transient families, due to their relative inability to respond to catastrophic financial situations, fre-

quently encounter emergency food needs. This is a gap that Denver Opportunity, Inc. (D.O.), in conjunction with over 55 metro Denver food box programs, is trying to fill.

Recognizing the frequency of this occurrence and the resource limitations of existing food box programs, D.O. has initiated various prevention and emergency assistance activities. These activities have two primary goals: (1) to provide self-help means for expanding nutritional quality and stretching limited food budgets within households, and (2) to increase the effectiveness of distributing available bulk foodstuffs for use in addressing emergency food needs.

The basic concept underlying D.O.'s Community Food and Nutrition Program (CFNP) activities is the awareness that a vast quantity of food resources are available from various sources, but just out of the reach of those in need. Food box programs fill a vital, emergency assistance role in a comprehensive anti-hunger effort, but are particularly limited by their inaccess to certain food resources and their inability to handle and distribute bulk foodstuffs (particularly perishables). The key to an effective food box program is the availability of adequate and nutritional foodstuffs. An example of the basic items in a nutritionally balanced food box is presented below.

Basic Food Box—to serve a family of 4 for three days: Cereal—12 oz. box; soup—2 pks. noodle ramen, 1 can cream of mushroom; dinners—2 pkg. macaroni and cheese, 1 can tuna, 1 pkg. noodles, 1 24-oz. beef stew; vegetables—3 cans; milk—3 qts. (dry equivalent); fruit—1 can; peanut butter—1 18-oz. jar; gelatin—2 boxes; bread—3 loaves, 2 pkg. rolls, 1 pkg. sweet rolls; margarine—1 stick.

Note: Fresh produce, and other staple items, are added in supplement to this basic composition, as available.

The Denver Metro area, due to its image in the early 1980's as a relatively strong job market area, has attracted a large population of laborers, many of which are semi- or unskilled. And due to the nature of the Denver Metro industrial base, these laborers frequently do not find employment equal to the type of income level of what they lost in the manufacturing centers in the Northeastern and Midwestern states. Consequently, these families are frequently in need of emergency food box assistance during the period of re-settling and job searching. The growth of this sector of needy is reflected in the growth of the number of food box programs in the Denver Metro area over this same period of time, as presented below.

	1981	1983
Metro Denver (total)	38	59
City of Denver	25	38
Suburbs	13	21

To meet this growing need, Denver Opportunity has implemented several food resource procurement strategies. One of the most successful locally based efforts has been the Co-Champion Food Drive (*C*ommunity *O*rganizations *C*ombatting *H*unger and *M*alnutrition *I*n *O*ur *N*eighborhoods). This operation, sponsored by several corporations and service organizations, mobilizes cash and food contributions for use among the food box programs. Denver Opportunity has also initiated working relationships with local grocers, food wholesalers and other bulk food handling operations to collect "day old" or surplus foodstuffs. These donations are repackaged at the Food Preservation Center into quantities compatible with food boxes and then distributed to those programs in need of restocking.

Yet, even with the availability of these foodstuffs, their inconsistent flow in terms of quality and quantity limits the stability of food box emergency food efforts. The food box programs need a consistent source of those foodstuffs that comprise the base of a food box (grain; dried milk; occasional meats, etc.). In the past, a portion of this base was available through federal commodities—at a cost. These costs charged by the local clearinghouse for commodities forced food box programs into a no-win choice or (1) expanding limited financial resources for nutritional staples, or (2) offering a less than adequate food box. Basically, food box programs cannot afford to purchase food staples if they are to maintain viability. The limited financial resources of food box programs play a vital role in "rounding-out" the composition of a food box after the staples items have been secured. Consequently, Metro Denver food box program operators, in the face of this no-win situation, pressured the clearinghouse to halt their charging for

commodities. But this has only solved part of the problem. Locally we are working on increasing the effectiveness of distributing commodities to food box programs. The assistance needed from the federal level is expansion of the types of commodities available to food box programs particularly items such as canned meats. A facility such as D.O.'s Food Preservation Center could easily and safely handle such commodities, re-packaging them into food-box-size quantities when necessary. These items, in conjunction with locally mobilized food and financial resources, would lead to the establishment of a food box network capable of effectively handling the growing number of emergency food needs.

Several other strategies for supplying food box programs are being employed by Denver Opportunity. In 1982, the Colorado State Legislature passed a "Gleaning Bill", providing state income tax incentives to encourage crop and livestock farmers to donate otherwise wasted foodstuffs to charitable organizations. This fresh produce greatly supplements summer food boxes; and in conjunction with D.O.'s newly established Food Preservation Center, such foodstuffs can now be preserved for year-long use in food boxes, thus putting to use an otherwise wasted resource at a very minimal cost, and at no cost to the client. Denver Opportunity strongly urges Congress and this sub-committee to take a closer look at the economic and social benefits of gleaning in the states where it is in use, and support and advocate for the passage of federal gleaning legislation such as that previously introduced by Senator Hatfield and Representative AuCoin.

Beyond these and other efforts to increase emergency assistance services to households, D.O. is also taking the lead with several self-help and self-sufficiency strategies. The key to such strategies is to provide a means by which the limited financial (and food stamp) resources of the low-income can be expanded. As is the case within many inner-city low-income neighborhoods, competitively priced grocers with quality merchandise are more the exception than the rule. Specifically, within north and northeast Denver, the void left by a lack of large scale grocers is consequently filled by an inundation of small, convenience stores, with a limited selection, almost no fresh produce and usually higher prices. And due to the relative convenience of these stores in comparison to travelling to grocers in other parts of the city, a significant portion of the low-income (particularly the low-income seniors with limited means of mobility), do their grocery shopping at these convenience stores. To counter-act the impact of this phenomenon upon low-income food budgets, D.O. has initiated a Farm-to-Market project.

Through the Farm-to-Market project, D.O. purchases farm-fresh produce at wholesale rates direct from the farmers and sells this produce at cost at various sites within the low-income neighborhoods. This project's objectives are threefold: the expansion of food budget purchasing capabilities; the enhancement of nutritional dietary quality; and the provision of available bulk food resources for low-income individuals to self-initiate food canning activities to assist with food budgeting and nutritional quality year-around.

During the summer months the Farm-to-Market projects reap immediate financial benefits for the low-income. When operated in conjunction with the Food Preservation Center these benefits can be expanded throughout the year. Low-income individuals, through a nominal ($5.00/year) membership fee, are provided access, training and assistance in using the food preservation equipment. Through this process, the individual is supplied with the necessary produce and equipment, and on their own motivation the individual can work toward supplementing their food budget (financially and nutritionally) throughout the non-harvest parts of the year.

In summation, Denver Opportunity wishes to extend an invitation to this sub-committee and to other food and nutrition service agencies around the country to visit our facilities and view our operations, for the possible implementation of similar activities in other urban settings.

STATEMENT OF HENDRIKA B. CANTWELL, M.D., CONSULTING PEDIATRICIAN, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES, DENVER, COLO.

INTRODUCTION

As the last person on this afternoon's program, I would like to take the prerogative of the naturalized citizen to express appreciation of the country which adopted me.

The "Food Basket" countries of Europe under totalitarian administrations suffer greatly from severe food shortages. The inventiveness, industry and superb management of the Agriculturists in our country deserve our deep appreciation because they feed us all so well, have enough surplus to export and then give generously to those in need of food. Generosity and production are, however, not quite sufficient. Managing distribution to those in need is difficult, but even that seems to be working well.

Mr. Armando Atencio, who is Manager of the Denver Department of Social Services, asked me to speak to the issue of hunger, as I see it.

I am the pediatrician who examines and interviews the children who come to Child Protective Services. About 150 children per month come to my attention, who are new to our system. They may be physically or sexually abused, neglected, failing to thrive, abandoned, left alone, and some are delinquent children.

PROBLEMS

I. Situations which might create "real" hunger

Since unemployment increased, we have seen more families who need help, mostly with "coping" in general, specifically with housing, sometimes with food.

(1) Because of availability of food related services, it is still the easiest to alleviate. We can get food!

(2) Marginal families are signed up for commodities [Supplemental Foods, W.I.C. Programs] at medical facilities. In Denver, through the clinics of Denver Health and Hospitals. Graciously, it helps all needy children under 6.

(3) The School Breakfast and Lunch Programs are keeping school-age children reasonably nourished although they need something at home. Cheese, pinto beans, bread with peanut butter or such, certainly can accommodate additional calories needed.

(4) Families who have not found access to the above seem to be able to get freely given foods at churches and community agencies.

(5) I have had some contact with "street people." Although they are very poorly organized individuals they know where they can be fed.

(6) Retarded, psychiatrically or physically disabled, and elderly people find sufficient community concern to be helped, or are referred to Social Services for assistance.

In Summary, the services to get food to those who need it seems to be working.

It would be non-existent if it were not made available and distributed to those who are in need. Without these services there would be "Real" hunger in Denver.

II. Food stamp program

(1) Most families use the program well. It is a Lifeline which keeps a family together "Tiding" them over, assuring food supply even though money is scarce. It saves money when it keeps families from going to ADC/ADCU. Too often ADC means that the father leaves. Food stamps often help sufficiently to retain the family unit. The family unit is much more likely to re-enter the job market than the ADC "split" family, where both spouses may have lost motivation.

(2) Abuses of Food Stamps exist. They are the minority. The problem is not the availability of this program but the disturbed state of those who abuse it.

Children starting at age four to five and beyond make statements:

"Mom won't cook for us, she always goes out."

Or . . . "She spent the money on booze, now there is no food."

"He sold our food stamps for a party . . . they smoked a lot o' pot."

Many variations on the theme of misspent money and food stamps are told by the children.

(3) Abuses are not the rule but the exception. The Food Stamp Program is so helpful that it must be preserved for the children who benefit.

Our rich society with food surplus can forgive the few, to serve those whom it will save from hunger.

III. Problems which are not related to lack of available food

(1) "Failure to Thrive"—This is a condition seen in early life [before 3 years]. The syndrome is a parental inability to nurture the baby on all levels including feeding the child. Availability of food is unrelated and teaching parents usually is not enough to reverse the process.

(2) Emotional Deprivational Dwarfism—is also not related to absence of food. The child does not grow.

The condition is caused by emotional rejection or psychological abuse.
It is accompanied with excessive eating and food hoarding by the child.

(3) Other small, thin children may come from:

(a) Parents who are Drug/Alcohol abusers [misuse of money and forgetting to feed children].

(b) Fetal Alcohol Syndrome: A child born to an alcohol abusing mother; remaining growth retarded.

(c) The family is very small.

(d) Child has an illness preventing normal growth.

(e) Lack of stability in home life [child has no meal time, sleep/nap time, household is chaotic, child dragged about all the time, all over town].

IV. To be contemplated

(1) Young families may not know about available food programs. [Outreach Teaching is recommended.]

(2) Children, now parents, raised with free Breakfast and Lunch School Programs see the school as being in charge of feeding their children. [Schools may need to involve students in food preparation starting in fifth grade or so.]

(3) T.V. advertising is expensive, pervasive, convincing—to eat Twinkies, McDonald's, Pizzas, coke, coffee, beer. [We, who care about feeding children well, must spend the money to "sell" good nutrition. Most young parents really don't know.]

(4) When food is given to families their cooking skills are deficient (We have "illiteracy" in cooking). (Food programs will be much improved in benefit if accompanied with innovative teaching: Fun—Games—Picnic—Cookouts—Parties—a la Tupperware.]

From Yeats' Poem: "The Second Coming . . ."

"The best lack all conviction
The worst are full of passionate intensity."

[The following are excerpts from a February 1983, report from the Office of Inspector General (USDA) regarding overissuances in the food stamp program in several major cities, including three—Nashville, New Orleans, and Washington, D.C.—represented at the hearings—Jesse Helms, chairman.]

PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY COMPUTER MATCHING PROJECT

SUMMARY REPORT OF PROJECT TO IDENTIFY AND VERIFY SIGNIFICANT UNDERREPORTING OF INCOME IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED BENEFIT PROGRAMS

Introduction

The Office of Inspectors General of the Departments of Health and Human Services (OIG–HHS) and Labor (OIG–DOL) co-chair an interagency project titled "Long Term Computer Matching" sponsored by the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency. The Office of Inspector General, Department of Agriculture (OIG–USDA), is a participant in the project and lead agency for a subsidiary project using computer matching to detect underreported earned income in federally assisted benefit programs. This report presents the results of the matches performed in the 1981–82 period with the assistance and cooperation of the Department of Justice, OIG–HHS, the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (OIG–HUD), and various state and local authorities.

The Food Stamp Act Amendments of 1980 (P.L. 96–249) require that State agencies administering unemployment compensation benefits disclose wage information upon request to State food stamp agencies beginning on January 1, 1983. Senate Report No. 97–290, 97th Congress, mandates that wage matching be implemented by each State agency no later than January 1, 1983. The Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (P.L. 97–98) further required that information concerning wages must be requested from the Social Security Administration (SSA) unless such information was requested from agencies administering the State unemployment compensation laws. (Legislation enacted May 26, 1980, had effectively removed barriers to the Department's and State agency's access to in-

come information in the files of the SSA and State Departments of Employment Security.) The Food and Nutrition Service developed final rules that were published in the Federal Register, Volume 47, No. 215, November 5, 1982, amending (effective January 1, 1983) 7 CFR 273.2(f)(9) of the food stamp regulations.

Objectives and approach

The objectives of the project were to identify program participants in selected large cities, who significantly underreported their incomes, to eliminate violators' future participation, to recover benefits overissued, and to investigate and prosecute program abusers as appropriate. The project was carried out at most locations by first matching the social security number (SSN) of recipients on Food Stamp Program (FSP) computer files (or in several instances on Public Assistance (PA) files) with a wage history file maintained by a Federal or State agency. At some locations a second match was required to indicate differences in reported income. The "raw hits" were then further processed to eliminate negligible underreporting and establish a data base of significant cases. Finally, the cases were either verified or examined for prosecution potential and referred to the appropriate Federal, State, or local agency for investigation and claims determination.

Scope

Seventeen matching programs were carried out at the following metropolitan areas: New York City, New York; State of New Jersey; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Washington, D.C.; Memphis/Nashville, Tennessee; Atlanta, Georgia; Savannah, Georgia; Birmingham, Alabama; Montgomery, Alabama; Raleigh, North Carolina; Greensboro, North Carolina; Asheville, North Carolina; New Orleans, Louisiana; Houston, Texas; St. Louis, Missouri; Cleveland/Columbus/Cincinnati, Ohio; and Los Angeles, California. OIG–USDA made the matches except in New York City where it was done by the Human Resources Administration; in New Jersey where it was done by the New Jersey Department of Human Services; in Ohio where it was done by the Auditor of State; and in Philadelphia where it was done by OIG–HHS. (OIG–HHS also performed a match in Chicago, Illinois. The results were reported separately and are not a part of this report.) The results of the matches were compiled through November 30, 1982, and work on fraud investigations and claims determinations is expected to continue through 1983.

Methodology for the matches

The 17 matches disclosed about 248,000 cases of underreported income. Briefly, the methods used to obtain these "raw hits" were as follows:

New York City.—The Human Resources Administration conducted two separate matches: One for PA benefits included the clients' food stamp benefits; the other for Non-Public Assistance (NPA) included food stamps only. (The PA files are not structured to isolate food stamp benefits from other assistance.) The results for the PA file cover a 16-month period; the NPA match covers a 9-month period. The revolving PA file averages about 326,000 cases per month and matching identified about 4,400 cases per month of underreported income. The NPA revolving file averages about 168,000 cases per month and matching identified an average of about 400 cases per month. For purposes of this project, we estimated a total of 74,000 cases as having underreported income.

New Jersey.—The New Jersey Department of Human Services matched the statewide food stamp file with employer wage data supplied to the New Jersey Department of Taxation. Matching over a 12-month period produced 88,723 cases of underreporting.

Philadelphia.—OIG–HHS matched the PA file maintained by the County Assistance Office with an income file of the State Office of Employment Security. OIG–USDA selected the food stamp exceptions for September 1981 for further analysis; OIG–HHS selected cases receiving only HHS benefits for review. OIG–USDA identified 36,054 households with underreported income of at least $100 per month.

Washington, D.C.—OIG–USDA matched the food stamp master file for June 1981 maintained by the Departemnt of Human Services with wage history files maintained by the Bureau of Employment Services and with wage files of adjacent State agencies. The initial match of one person households produced 2,250 "hits" and a second match of multiple person households produced 11,250 "hits" which showed underreported income.

Memphis/Nashville.—OIG–USDA matched the food stamp participation file as of March 31, 1980, with the Tennessee Department of Employment Security wage history files for the period January 1, 1979, through March 31, 1980. The result was a record of wages for a 5-quarter period. This record was manually compared to a food stamp file of reported income to produce an exception data base. The universe of 82,026 cases produced 1,606 cases of underreported income.

Atlanta.—OIG–USDA matched the food stamp participation file as of June 30, 1981 (Fulton and DeKalb Counties) and as of September 30, 1981 (Clayton and Cobb Counties) with wage history files maintained by the Georgia Department of Labor for the previous 5-quarter period. This record was manually compared to a food stamp file of reported income to produce an exception data base. The universe of 53,526 cases produced 6,174 cases of underreported income.

Savannah.—OIG–USDA matched the food stamp participation file as of De-December 31, 1980, with wage history files maintained by the Alabama Depart-Labor for the period October 1, 1980, through December 31, 1981. This record was manually compared to a food stamp file of reported income as of March 1982 to establish an exception data base. The universe of 9,573 cases produced 667 cases of underreported income.

Birmingham.—OIG–USDA matched the food stamp participation file as of December 31, 1980, with wage history files maintained by the Alabama Department of Industrial Relations for the period October 1, 1979, through December 31, 1980. The result was a record of wages for a 5-quarter period. This record was manually compared to a food stamp file of reported income as of December 31, 1980, to establish an exception data base. The universe of 25,913 cases projected 1,019 cases of underreported income.

Montgomery.—OIG–USDA matched the food stamp participation file as of August 31, 1981, with wage history files maintained by the Alabama Department of Industrial Relations for the period July 1, 1980, through September 30, 1981. The result was a record of wages for a 5-quarter period. This record was annually compared to a food stamp file of reported income as of August 31, 1981, to establish an exception data base. The universe of 9,216 cases produced 1,059 cases of underreported income.

Raleigh.—OIG–USDA matched the food stamp participation file as of December 1981 with wage history files maintained by the North Carolina Employment Security Commission for the period July 1, 1980, through December 31, 1981. The result was a record of wages for a 6-quarter period. This record was manually compared to a food stamp file of reported income as of December 31, 1981, to establish an exception data base. The universe of 10,000 cases produced 1,700 cases of underreported income.

Greensboro.—OIG–USDA matched the food stamp participation file as of September 1981 with wage history files maintained by the North Carolina Employment Security Commission for the period October 1980, through December 31, 1981. The result was a record of wages for a 5-quarter period. This record was manually compared to a food stamp file of reported income as of December 31, 1981, to establish an exception data base. The universe of 10,000 cases produced 1,622 cases of underreported income.

Asheville.—OIG–USDA matched the food stamp participation file as of September 1981 with wage history files maintained by the North Carolina Employment Security Commission for the period October 1, 1980, through March 31, 1982. The result was a record of wages for a 6-quarter period. This record was manually compared to a food stamp file of reported income as of March 31, 1981, to establish an exception data base. The universe of 5,086 cases produced 1,100 cases of underreported income.

New Orleans.—OIG–USDA matched the food stamp participation file for the quarter ending December 1981 with wage history files maintained by the Louisiana Department of Employment Security for the same period. The result was a record of wages for the 3-month period. This record was then matched with the food stamp master file to produce an exception data base of 6,368 households that had underreported their monthly earned income by $100 or more.

Houston.—OIG–USDA obtained a match of food stamp households who had reported third-quarter 1981 wages to the Texas Employment Commission. The result was 5,786 households (8,632 matches) that had reported earned income of $300 or more for the quarter. The food stamp file of SSNs did not include income; therefore, the food stamp households were stratified and statistically sampled for underreported income.

St. Louis.—OIG-USDA matched the food stamp participation file for December 1981 with wage history files maintained by the Missouri Department of Employment Security for the fourth-quarter of 1981. The result was a record of 2,122 food stamp households with underreported income of $100 or more.

Cleveland/Columbus/Cincinnati.—The Ohio Auditor of State used matching techniques to identify public employees in 17 counties receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children and/or food stamp benefits. OIG-USDA selected 3 of the 17 counties for further review (Cuyahoga, Franklin and Hamilton). This included 1,162 cases. (Ohio is not a wage reporting State; thus income reported for food stamp benefits cannot readily be compared to other wage history files.)

Los Angeles.—OIG-USDA matched the food stamp participation file for August 1980 with wage history files maintained by the California Employment Development Department, the Federal Office of Personnel Management, and the United States Navy Finance Center. This produced 8,998 cases of underreported income. A further match in January 1982 found 2,688 of these cases still participating in the Food Stamp Program.

Criteria for significant underreporting of income

Generally, the matches were programmed to identify recipients with a difference of $300 per quarter or $100 per month between Food Stamp Program reported income and the wage matching source. Then the results were matched or manually compared with current Food Stamp Program participation files as necessary to determine if the households identified were still receiving benefits. Finally, the total estimated overissuances for the period of the review were estimated. In Philadelphia and New Orleans, the underreported income was stratified by dollar category; in the former, all cases with differences over $2,000 were examined; and in the latter, all cases over $1,000 per month were examined. The balance of the cases at each location were statistically sampled. Overall, the process continued by determining (1) the food stamp cases with Federal prosecution potential, (2) the food stamp cases appropriate for local fraud investigation and claims determination, and (3) the public assistance cases suitable for referral to other Federal agencies for action.

Action on significant cases

As of November 30, 1982, the results of followup action on the food stamp cases were:

Over 16,000 recipients had either been taken off the roles or had their benefits reduced. The savings just for those cases on an annualized basis is estimated at approximately $21.3 million.

About 2,700 cases were referred to Federal, State, or local authorities for fraud investigation and claims determination. These cases are being resolved.

In Memphis, the U.S. attorney met with OIG-HHS and OIG-USDA staffs and selected about 100 cases for multiple program prosecution. Similar action may result at other locations as the extent of fraud is determined.

With respect to other public assistance cases:

Approximately 4,400 cases were referred to OIG-HHS. Claims determinations had been completed on 823 cases for about $1.1 million.

Approximately 7,400 cases were referred to OIG-HUD. Claims determinations had been completed on 280 cases for about $369,000.

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
September 28, 1983.

Hon. JESSE HELMS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HELMS: As you requested, please find attached written responses to the questions you submitted in a letter dated July 27, 1983. I regret that I was unable to reply sooner, but as previously mentioned in my letter of August 12th, an extensive amount of time was involved in conducting the research necessary to comply with your request. Also, attached is a list of contact persons affiliated with agencies who administer feeding or related programs. A significant part of the information contained in the responses was provided by the individuals listed.

You are to be commended for your concern about the effectiveness of Federal food programs. If you have any further questions please contact Mrs. Alvertha Bratton Penny, Director of the Office of Planning and Community Services at (504) 586-3144.

Sincerely,

ERNEST N. MORIAL, *Mayor.*

Question 1. You indicated that "cutbacks in Federal food assistance programs" have resulted in increased requests for emergency food assistance. To what specific cutbacks do you refer? Which, if any, should be restored?

Answer. In a survey of emergency food program administrators two principle factors were identified as contributing to the increase in requests for emergency food assistance in New Orleans. The two factors are: (1) the rise in unemployment and (2) cutbacks in the AFDC and Food Stamp programs. In terms of the latter factor, there is a consensus among program administrators that persons removed from those two programs now seek to supplement food supplies through emergency food centers. The director of the local food bank indicated that the demand for food packages increased 67 percent during the past year. She also stated that "a majority of the clients are faced with the following types of problems: prolonged illness, fire damaged housing, unemployment, and diminishing welfare assistance." The table below shows the significant decline in the number of households receiving AFDC benefits after Federal cutbacks were instituted in October, 1981.

AFDC active caseload in Orleans Parish, 1978–83

	Households
1978:	
1st 6 mo	16,677
2d 6 mo	16,413
1979:	
1st 6 mo	16,695
2d 6 mo	17,175
1980:	
1st 6 mo	17,531
2d 6 mo	18,180
1981:	
1st 6 mo	18,130
2d 6 mo	17,149
1982:	
1st 6 mo	15,656
2d 6 mo	15,602
1983: 1st 6 mo	16,238

Question 2. To what specific actions do you refer when you speak of "attempts at the Federal level cut the women, infants, and children program"?

Answer. In fiscal year 1982, the Reagan Administration proposed to cut the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) to $633 million, one-third less than its fiscal year 1981 budget. Congress only allowed a four percent reduction and set funding at $945 million.

In fiscal year 1983, although WIC was funded at $1.06 billion this increase did not prevent 150,000 participants from being dropped from the program. Originally, the Reagan Administration proposed giving states reduced WIC funds through a nutrition program block grant. The Administration also proposed that a current requirement, which says 80 percent of WIC monies must be spent on food, be removed.

Question 3. You referred to the Child Care Food Program. Are you familiar with recent USDA figures which indicate that approximately two-thirds of all participants in the day care home component of the child care food program would be in the highest income category—in the paying category (if such a category existed)?

Answer. We do not have any statistics which show the income categories of Child Care Food Program (CCFP) participants. Presently, there are only two home centers operating in New Orleans, and six others are becoming operational.

There are 26 day care centers in the CCFP program in New Orleans. However, statistics on day care centers show that 80 percent of participants are in the free category, 9 percent in the reduced category, and 11 percent in the highest category. They serve an average of 6,500 children per day, and 1,500,000 meals per year.

Although you cite USDA figures which indicate that two-thirds of all participants in the day care home component of CCFP would be in the high income category, this may not apply to New Orleans and other cities with large concentrations of poor people, as urban areas differ in terms of demographics from the country as a whole. According to 1980 R. L. Polk statistics 22 percent of all households in New Orleans have incomes below the poverty level, and 45.3 percent are classified as having lower incomes. In fact, 71,594 2+ persons households are eligible for most Federal programs.

Question 4. As you know there is no requirement that individuals served by the summer food service program must be low income. What information do you have to support your contention that this program is serving exclusively low-income students?

Answer. My written testimony, presented to the Rural Development Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee June 13, 1983, does not state that the summer food service program serves low-income students exclusively. It states that the program "each year serves over 200,000 lunches and 100,000 breakfasts to low-income students." USDA guidelines require that at least one-third of the student-body of schools participating in the program be from low-income households. As an additional note, 85 percent of the students who participate in the Orleans Parish School Board Lunch Program are in the free meal category. Additionally, nearly two-fifths (40 percent) of all children in Orleans Parish live in households with incomes below poverty.

Question 5. You indicated that the New Orleans food stamp participation "has decreased to the point where we are forced to cut back service to its 1978 levels." How many people (and what percentage) participate in the food stamp program? Would you provide a record of each month's participation since 1978?

Answer.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM—ORLEANS PARISH HOUSEHOLDS, PERSONS, AND COUPONS, JANUARY 1978 TO JUNE 1983

	Households	Persons	Coupons
1978:			
January	25,974	86,256	2,594,251
February	25,835	85,881	2,598,042
March	26,085	86,477	2,626,688
April	25,900	85,767	2,610,297
May	25,855	85,713	2,623,863
June	25,811	85,471	2,632,435
July	25,745	85,424	2,782,039
August	25,923	85,715	2,858,384
September	25,718	84,897	2,753,558
October	25,802	84,769	2,748,741
November	26,028	85,078	2,760,710
December	25,986	84,817	2,734,531
1979:			
January	27,327	88,732	3,056,635
February	28,476	91,746	3,103,868
March	29,920	94,331	3,248,217
April	31,053	97,074	3,413,658
May	32,186	99,920	3,495,364
June	33,090	101,972	3,556,894
July	33,751	103,642	3,935,621
August	34,993	106,712	4,071,015
September	35,449	107,614	4,014,538
October	36,378	109,670	4,114,872
November	36,625	109,954	4,087,882
December	36,887	110,180	4,096,200
1980:			
January	37,467	111,404	4,342,366
February	37,967	112,393	4,414,143
March	38,679	113,746	4,477,508
April	38,840	113,738	4,443,822
May	38,777	113,506	4,412,662
June	39,245	114,535	4,464,098
July	39,641	115,273	4,399,632
August	39,972	115,702	4,406,219
September	40,268	115,903	4,320,552
October	40,650	116,194	4,330,387
November	39,960	114,531	4,255,104
December	40,194	114,659	4,246,262
1981:			
January	40,336	114,273	5,054,599
February	40,984	114,635	5,105,984
March	40,885	114,379	5,074,522
April	40,642	113,457	5,014,878
May	40,111	112,029	4,947,175
June	40,381	112,236	4,992,789
July	40,292	111,821	4,821,332
August	41,417	112,002	4,849,584
September	40,029	111,062	4,703,812
October	38,997	108,555	4,585,142
November	39,387	106,521	4,457,404
December	36,632	104,479	4,360,091

	Households	Persons	Coupons
1982:			
January	35,945	102,381	4,232,758
February	35,747	102,126	4,236,345
March	35,697	102,403	4,259,909
April	35,191	101,424	4,198,534
May	34,666	100,658	4,163,820
June	34,761	101,362	4,198,539
July	34,628	101,095	4,104,434
August	34,673	101,619	4,144,593
September	34,726	101,528	4,139,919
October	35,056	99,902	4,530,479
November	34,510	100,725	4,667,198
December	35,072	102,455	4,767,674
1983:			
January	35,001	102,796	4,703,645
February	35,019	102,630	4,724,380
March	35,326	104,026	4,837,045
April	35,008	102,574	4,737,356
May	35,187	102,962	4,770,974
June	35,241	103,353	4,778,098

Note: Statistics from R. L. Polk "1980 Profiles of Change" show that there are 48,466 poverty households in New Orleans. In comparison only 35,000 households now receive food stamps. At the peak of participation in the food stamp program in August 1981, 41,000 households participated in the program. In preparing my remarks the data used was a graphic display reflecting the total number of households receiving food stamps between 1978 and 1983. As evidenced by the above data collected on a month-by-month basis, food stamp participation has decreased to a level comparable to 1979 levels as opposed to 1978 levels as originally stated in my testimony.

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL POPULATION PARTICIPATING IN FOOD STAMP PROGRAM BY YEAR

[Total population: 557,515 (1980 census)]

	Average persons per month [1]	Percent of all persons
1978	85,522	15.3
1979	101,796	18.2
1980	114,298	20.5
1981	111,287	20.0
1982	101,473	18.2
1983	103,056	18.5

[1] Average number of persons per month participating in program.

Note: The percent of all persons participating in the food stamp program was calculated by dividing the average number of persons per month participating by the 1980 census count (557,515) for each individual year (1978–83). The 1980 census figure was used in the calculation of percentages because it is the most reliable count available. Also, it is a close approximation of the population in the years 1978–83 as New Orleans' population changes an average of less than ½ of 1 percent a year.

Question 6. Regarding the special distribution program for surplus commodities, what income criteria or other standards of eligibility have been in effect in your city since the program was initiated in December 1981 and what are they currently?

Answer. The State did not establish specific income criteria for the first five distributions. Agencies were instructed to utilize whatever "low income" criteria they were presently following. Therefore, the following eligibility criteria was used for the first five distributions: Households receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI); Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC); Medicaid; Old Age Assistance, Food Stamps and/or other forms of public assistance were automatically eligible. Persons not receiving any form of public assistance but whose family income fell within the prescribed poverty income index of any social welfare, education, or health institution were also eligible to receive USDA donated commodities.

Special considerations were given to the elderly and to handicapped persons.

Beginning February 1983 the following criteria were issued by the State for use in determining eligibility:

1. Resident of applicable parish.

2. Applicant must provide required information (e.g., SSI, Welfare Card, Food Stamp Card, etc.) and income verification.

3. Income eligibility 185 percent of the 1982 Federal Poverty Income Guidelines as published in the Federal Register (Vol. 47, No. 69, April 9, 1982):

Size of family unit:	Nonfarm family	Farm family
1	$8,660	$7,420
2	11,510	9,820
3	14,360	12,230
4	17,210	14,630
5	20,060	17,040
6	22,910	19,440

Note: For each additional member add $2,850 for nonfarm families and $2,400 for farm families.

4. Elderly (55 and up) and extreme need.
5. Hardship—extended illness, etc.

Question 7. Do you have any statistics on the income or other characteristics of those who have been served by the commodity distribution program in your city. Do you have any information on what percentage may be also receiving food stamps?

Answer. The average size of those families served was five persons; a large percentage (approximately 30–45 percent) were also receiving food stamps. During the 1983 distributions, the average income of families receiving the commodities was forty to fifty percent less than that established by the State. These figures represent Total Community Action estimates based upon clients served at the large distribution centers.

Question 8. Would you outline the amount of surplus commodities that have been distributed in your city during each of the months since the program was first announced in December 1981? Has the city contributed any money to the distribution effort?

Answer. Total Community Action Incorporated (TCA) has distributed USDA donated commodities to eligible New Orleans residents since February 1982. Below is a list of distribution dates and allocation per distribution:

February, 1982	1,694 cases of cheese.
March, 1982	1,694 cases of cheese.
July, 1982	7,132 cases of cheese.
November, 1982	6,000 cases of cheese.
December, 1982	750 cases of butter.
February, 1983	8,960 cases of cheese, 3,600 cases of butter.
March, 1983	8,960 cases of cheese, 3,600 cases of butter.
April, 1983	8,680 cases of cheese, 8,301 cases of butter.
May, 1983	8,680 cases of cheese, 3,201 cases of butter.

The city of New Orleans has not contributed any funds directly to the distribution effort, but has provided equipment and personnel to assist in the effort. So far this year, the city provided TCA with two trucks (including drivers) for the March 1983 distribution and one truck (with driver) for the May 1983 distribution.

Question 9. With regard to the school lunch program, would you provide the number of students participating in each of the three income categories, and the amount of Federal assistance received for each such category during the past 3–5 years? What has been the city's contribution to this program?

Answer.

STUDENTS IN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM BY INCOME CATEGORY

	Students	Percentage
School year 1979–80:		
Students free	51,233	83.1
Students reduced	1,639	2.7
Students paid	8,738	14.2
Total	61,610	100.0

STUDENTS IN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM BY INCOME CATEGORY—Continued

	Students	Percentage
School year 1980–81:		
Students free	51,668	81.9
Students reduced	2,646	4.3
Students paid	8,518	13.8
Total	62,852	100.0
School year 1981–82:		
Students free	51,147	83.5
Students reduced	2,318	3.8
Students paid	7,788	12.7
Total	61,253	100.0
School year 1982–83:		
Students free	55,250	85
Students reduced	1,950	3
Students paid	7,800	12
Total	65,000	100

REIMBURSEMENT RATE PER MEAL BY SCHOOL TERM AND SOURCE

Term period	Reduced	Free	Overall Federal	State
September to December 1979	66¼¢	76¼¢	17¢	9¢
January to June 1980	67½¢	79½¢	17¾¢	9¢
September to December 1980	73½¢	83½¢	18½¢	9¢
January to June 1981	63½¢	83½¢	18½¢	9¢
August 1981	71½¢	91½¢	18½¢	9¢
September 1981 to May 1982	58¾¢	98¾¢	[1] 12½¢	9¢
August 1982 to May 1983	64¢	$1.04	13¢	9¢
August 1983 to May 1984 (proposed)	68¾¢	$1.08	13½¢	9¢

[1] The lowering of the Federal reimbursement rate indirectly caused 3,000 paying students to drop out of the program, as the price of lunch was raised from 30¢ to 90¢ to make up for lost revenues.

Note: The above-mentioned categories are defined as follows: (1) Free: The Federal Government pays the entire cost of meal; (2) Reduced: The Federal Government pays the amount shown and the student pays the balance; (3) Overall Federal: The Federal Government pays amount shown for every student; (4) State: The State pays the amount shown for every student.

In response to your question regarding the city's contribution to this program, neither the city of New Orleans nor the Orleans Parish School Board contributes money to the program. The city and the School Board are completely separate and independent local government structures. The Federal Government will provide $12,000,000 and the State government will provide $6,000,000 for operating funds for the 1983–84 Orleans Parish School Board School Lunch and Breakfast Programs.

Question 10. Would you outline what percentage of WIC recipients in your city fall into each of the six priority categories? For example, the first priority in the WIC program covers pregnant women, breastfeeding women, and infants determined to be at nutritional risk by a blood test—or some other documented medical condition.

Answer.

WIC participants by category, June 1983

Category:	*Participants*
Women	386
Infants	1,888
Children	652
Total number of participants	2,928

NOTE.—Statistics on program participants are only aggregated by the three categories shown in the table, and are unavailable by priority area.

Question 11. Does the WIC program operate in the same areas that the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) operates? What is the difference

in eligibility for CSFP versus WIC participation? What is the relative size of the CSFP program compared to the WIC program in New Orleans? Has the city considered consolidation of the programs, in order to reduce administrative expenses and insure that more dollars will actually go to providing food assistance?

Answer. Eligibility differences between WIC and CSFP are as follows:

(1) WIC participants' gross incomes cannot exceed 145 percent of the poverty level.

(2) CSFP participants' gross income cannot exceed 185 percent of the poverty level.

Other programmatic differences are:

(1) WIC operates on a voucher system, with 28 grocery stores honoring the vouchers; CSFP participants must pick up their food packages at a designated time and place.

(2) Considering the participant's age and/or condition, WIC issues a food package consisting primarily of dairy foods such as milk, eggs, and cheese, and fruit juice, and cereal. Considering the participant's age and/or condition, CSFP issues a food package consisting primarily of canned and dried foods such as canned meat, canned vegetables and fruit, dried beans, hot cereal, and peanut butter.

(3) WIC serves mothers up to 6 months post-partum and children from 0–5 years; and CSFP serves mothers up to 12 months post-partum and children from 0–6 years.

Relative sizes of the two programs are:

(1) WIC has an allocation caseload of 4,100 per month; and CSFP has an allocation caseload of 21,125 per month.

(2) Only 66 percent of the eligible population's nutritional needs are being met by both programs.

The city has not considered consolidating the two programs because the federal policies which govern the programs differ. Program eligibility for WIC is contingent on a nutritional evaluation by a designated health care institution as well as income status, while CSFP certification is primarily based on meeting income eligibility requirements.

Question 12. Aside from the Federal food assistance programs, does the city provide any city financed food assistance? In what form?

Answer. The city provides a cash grant yearly to the local food bank, a private non-profit emergency food "stockpile" agency. This year's grant is $4,000. In addition to providing money for the food bank, the city has sponsored numerous food drives to help stock the food bank. For example, in November 1982 over 8,000 city employees donated food to the food bank. The city is currently sponsoring a 1983 Food Drive scheduled for October.

Question 13. With regard to the food stamp program in your city, do you utilize photo identification to prevent fraud? Have you used wage matches to detect unreported income and fraudulent participation? What is the overissuance error rate in your city?

Answer. The Louisiana Department of Health and Human Resources Office of Family Security utilizes both photo identification and wage match to detect fraud in the Food Stamp Program.

In response to your request for the overissuance rate in New Orleans, the table below shows the error rates for overissuance and underissuance of food stamp benefits in Orleans Parish. The data represents the findings of the Quality Control Section of the Bureau of Special Services of the Office of Family Security.

ERROR RATE REPORTED ACCORDING TO ALLOTMENT AMOUNT

[In percent]

Period of review	Overissuance (cases)		Underissuance (cases)	
March to September 1981	8.8	(18.4)	2.6	(8.9)
October 1981 to March 1982	5.7	(13.4)	1.8	(6.9)
March to September 1982	5.3	(14.7)	2.1	(5.7)

Question 14. How many cases (and what percentage of the case load) were identified as fraudulently participating in your city's food stamp program as a result of an investigation by the Office of Inspector General?

Answer. The U.S. Department of Agriculture Regional Office of Inspector General reports 17 indictments and 16 convictions of fraud in the Orleans Parish Food Stamp Program during fiscal year 1982–83. This represents four hundredths of 1 percent of the 35,000 households who participate in the program.

Question 15. Several mayors seem to suggest support expansion of Federal food assistance programs in time of economic hardship. As the economy improves, do you support a corresponding reduction in these programs?

Answer. Based on June 1983, "Hunger in American Cities" report published by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the eight cities for which case studies were developed cited unemployment as the primary cause of increased problems of hunger. The findings of this report point to the problem of "cyclical" hunger that might be triggered by the rise in unemployment. As such, additional studies are needed to assess the correlation between hunger and unemployment in this country. In the event that such a correlation is found to exist, supplemental federal programs should be developed that would be activated in response to this economic and social situation. Additionally, in order to avoid the lag between the onset of these conditions and the federal government's response a federal mechanism should be established that would automatically trigger these supplemental programs as opposed to the one year lag time we have traditionally been faced with.

A food assistance policy should be developed which addresses the long term problem of hunger and which is not subject to modifications based upon temporary fluctuations in the state of the economy. This policy should be directly correlated to the overall social and economic policy of this country. For decades hunger has been identified as a persistent problem inextricably tied to poverty regardless of inflation or unemployment rates. Production curves cannot and should not be used as indicators of how well we are serving the real poor in this country because capacity to produce enough food to feed our population is not proportionate with financial ability of people to obtain food. The key to reducing hunger is not through cutting food assistance programs, but rather through effective program reform including on-going assessment of existing programs and administrative guidelines. In short, our program should respond to need based on an assessment of the real hunger and malnutrition of this nation for which information is desperately lacking.

SOURCES

Most of the information contained in this paper was obtained through personal interviews with the following people:

Cheron Brylski, City of New Orleans, Office of Public Information, New Orleans, La.

Patricia Comstock, Orleans Parish School Board Food Service Department, New Orleans, La.

Gayle Dunbar, Regional Consultant, Louisiana Office of Family Security, New Orleans, La.

Pearlie Elloie, Total Community Action Inc., New Orleans, La.

David Hall, Louisiana Department of Education, Office of Family Day Care, Baton Rouge, La.

Anne Harlan, Community Food Distribution Center, New Orleans, La.

Robert Olstian, U.S. Department of Agriculture Inspector General Office, Temple, Tex.

Anne Slattery, City of New Orleans, Health Department, New Orleans, La.

The remaining information was obtained from R. L. Polk, "1980 Profiles of Change."

CITY OF DETROIT EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
October 7, 1983.

Senator JESSE HELMS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HELMS: Attached please find the responses to questions you raised as a result of my testimony before the Senate Hearing held by Senator Andrews, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Rural Development, Oversight and Investigations.

This testimony was given on June 13, 1983, at the United States Conference of Mayors Annual Meeting in Denver, at which time the Conference of Mayors released its study of Hunger in America's Cities. It is my hope that the attached information will give added insight into the scope of the problems we are faced with in the City of Detroit.

We do not use the term "human emergency" lightly, as any rational reading of this response will indicate. I feel very strongly that the time for a careful re examination of our national budget priorities is long overdue. We cannot ignore the many hundreds of thousands of Americans across this country for whom the term "economic recovery" is a fantasy.

The economy of the United States can only be considered sound when we can measure our economic health in terms of people leading productive, fulfilling lives instead of the current measure of profits for a precious few.

As Mayor of the sixth largest city in the United States, I have always supported programs based on need. In answer to your question—would I support reductions in Federal food assistance programs as the economy improves—the answer is yes. I do, however, share with other mayors and with millions of Americans a sense of moral outrage at the fact that millions of Americans are faced with real need and that Hunger has indeed become a reality in cities across our nation.

Since my support of Federal food assistance programs is based on need, I feel very strongly that we must receive massive and immediate assistance from the Federal Government if we are to avert real tragedy during the coming months.

Sincerely,

COLEMAN A. YOUNG, *Mayor.*

Question 1. You referred to the Conference of Mayors examination of hunger in eight cities. How is hunger defined and identified in this examination?

Answer. The United States Conference of Mayors' presentation in Denver in June, 1983 did not set out to define hunger, that is, to characterize or identify the essential qualities and the meaning of hunger in any scientific sense.

We're satisfied to use the Webster's dictionary definition of hunger. If we are to operate under the definition of hunger contained in the dictionary, it is as follows: an urgent need for food, an uneasy sensation occasioned by the lack of food, and a weakened disordered condition brought about by the lack of access to an adequate supply of food.

In Detroit, we are convinced that people do not subject themselves to the humiliation of soup lines and other emergency food programs unless they are experiencing real need.

We have, for years, seen the effects of hunger and malnutrition reflected in our health statistics, the educational performance of our children, and the chronic illness and depression which besets too many of our people.

An October, 1982 survey of 55 cities by the United States Conference of Mayors discovered that the combined effects of federal budget cuts, economic conditions and high unemployment had led to a shocking increase in the demand for emergency food assistance. Consequently, the conference under took a brief examination of hunger in eight American cities, among them, the city of Detroit.

Question 2. Do you have any specific evidence to support your contention that "whole families (are now) in those soup lines" or that there is "an increasing number of women as well as men?"

Answer. In a survey of fifteen soup kitchens conducted in July of 1983, all attested to a more than 100% increase in the number of families requesting service over the last eighteen months to two years. Twenty-two soup kitchens now function in Detroit.

Those soup kitchens who had historically dealt with the indigent population peculiar to any large urban area had been accustomed to serving single adult males so that these charitable institutions were among the first to note this distinct change in their clientele which now included many more adult females and families with young children.

The individuals who call our hotline with food emergencies (nearly fifty thousand within the last seven months) represent entire households averaging about four persons per household according to information recorded by the intake workers who respond to and screen those calls.

The individuals who stand in line for commodities once a month represent more than 50,000 households averaging three persons per household according to information obtained by our staff during the commodities registration process.

Question 3. What is the basis for your assertion that "half of the world's supply of butter is in warehouses' cold storage somewhere in the United States"?

Answer. In April, 1983 the U.S. Government owned, among other surplus commodities, 441.2 million pounds of butter. As of September 9, 1983 the figure was 414.6 million pounds. This information was obtained by members of the Michigan congressional delegation at my request.

In the literal sense, this may or may not reflect the equivalent of "half the world's supply of butter," however, we have repeatedly asked the United States Department of Agriculture for accurate and up to-date information on this matter at least half dozen times in as many months. The USDA has been less than forthright in coming up with a response.

The point I am making is that the USDA has significant quantities of food at its disposal and access to a vast array of nutritionally valuable foods.

Furthermore, I share the sense of outrage so many of our citizens express as reports come to us from many national and local publications on government food supplies held in storage, donations or sales of grain to foreign countries and farmer-held reserves literally spilling out of the roof tops of storage bins,

Perhaps there would not be cause for so much public reaction of, first, there was not such an urgent need to feed millions right here in the United States and secondly, if the USDA were more forthright in supplying accurate and up-to-date information on government-held food supplies to the people of the United States.

We ask, once again, what is the general inventory of commodities for human consumption held in various USDA programs and under what authorities might they be released?

Question 4. What is the basis for your statement that "fully 25 percent of the people" in Detroit are "under-nourished or hungry?" What is your definition of "under-nourished" or "hungry?" Additionally, what is the evidence that food stamps are reaching "only 35 percent of the needy population monthly?" What percent of Detroit's citizens are participating in the food stamp program? If you are suggesting that some who are eligible are not participating, to what do you attribute this situation?

Answer. Going back to the dictionary's definition of the word hunger, we would describe this condition on a weakened and disordered condition brought about by the lack of access to an adequate food supply on a regular basis.

Nutritionists and health experts readily agree that the costs and the time it would take to screen each and every individual who expresses a need for supplemental food are excessive and impractical.

For our purposes, we feel that it is sufficient to look at a variety of indices which, when combined, create all the ingredients of a human emergency.

Based on all that we have observed and the data on living conditions which we have gathered, it did not require too much intelligence or expertise for any rational individual to acknowledge that all the elements of hunger and conditions which contribute to malnutrition are indeed present in our community in alarmingly high degrees.

The population of the city of Detroit on public assistance as of July 1983 is projected to be 425,000 persons according to the State Department of Social Services or 35 percent of the total population of the city, which is 1,203,339 according to the U.S. Census Bureau, 1980.

The Federal Department of Health and Human Services annually publishes poverty income guidelines as the Senate well knows. According to those published in the Federal Register for this year. (February 17, 1983) poverty level guidelines are as follows:

Family size	*Poverty*
1-person household	$4,860
2-person household	6,540
3-person household	8,220
4-person household	9,900
5-person household	11,500
6-person household	13,260

The average public assistance payment per recipient in the city of Detroit in August 1983 was $153.94. This comes to $1,747.28 annually.

The average monthly payment in Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) is $368.84 per case per month. This comes to $4,426.08 annually.

The average household size for AFDC is three persons per household. In the care of AFDC where unemployment is the root cause and both parents are in the household but not working, the average case size is four persons per household and a monthly income of $462.17, or $5,546.04 annually.

In the case of those individuals receiving food stamps, if they are non-public assistance households, they receive $37.95 per recipient per month. If they are receiving some category of public assistance such as AFDC, their monthly allotment of food stamps averages about $46.62 monthly. In any cases this averages out to between $0.49 to $0.51 per person per meal, obviously well below Federal poverty level guidelines.

The U.S. Census Bureau informs us that as of 1980, fully 22 percent of the population of the city of Detroit was living at or below the poverty level.

The nearly 70,000 persons eligible for the WIC program, the 35 percent increase in usage of our public health clinics and the incidents in infant mortality in the city of Detroit are all further indicators that there is tremendous need in this city.

Further evidence is, of course, the more than 300 percent increase in demand for service experienced by emergency food providers in the city of Detroit.

A recent example, Holy Cross Baptist Church opened an emergency food kitchen in December. They began feeding perhaps 75–150 persons per day. They now feed several thousand a week. This increase occurred in a thirty day period.

The same phenomena occurs over and over, as emergency food kitchens and food closets open their clientele burgeons well beyond their expectations within a few weeks.

The city of Detroit has determined that less than one out of every four unemployed persons is actually collecting unemployment benefits.

In fact, the ratio of unemployment claims to those recorded as unemployed has dropped from 30 percent in January 1983 to 24 percent in May.

Through our emergency relief programs in the city of Detroit, we have recorded more than 450,000 incidents of service in the last eight months, more than 90 percent of them food-related.

In response to the alarming trend in increased demand for emergency food assistance here in Detroit, I initiated a hotline in December, 1982 to respond to those in need. In less than eight full months of operation this emergency hotline has distributed more than 1.2 million pounds of food to needy families. These foods were contributed by city employees, businesses and civic organizations in the city of Detroit and by private citizens.

Too many of our children are not only hungry, but suffering long lasting, damaging side effects from that need.

Perhaps, in the city of Detroit, we are too cautious in our estimate that fully 25 percent of the people of our city are hungry or malnourished.

Leland Hall, the Director of the Office of Food Programs for the Michigan Department of Social Services reports that, "There are many people who are marginally ineligible for food stamps and those who are eligible have been burdened with freezes in cost of living adjustments to allotment levels and standard deductions.

"There are many people ineligible for food stamps because they have countable assets in excess of $1,500—which is the amount in the current law. However, this amount has not been increased to reflect changes in asset values since the 1977 Act.

"Under current law, for example, a household is not eligible for food stamps if they have a motor vehicle whose fair market value exceeds $4,500 and the value above $4,500 exceeds the asset limit of $1,500. Under current law, non-elderly/disabled households whose gross income exceeds 130 percent of the federal poverty standard are not eligible for benefits."

In addition, many who are eligible find the means tests for Food Stamps time-consuming and humiliating. They are discouraged by a system which requires them to make several trips to the caseworker supplying innumerable details, filling out forms and then waiting, often for the maximum time allowable under law, 45 days, only to be told that they have been denied, or that forms were not filled out properly or that they must for some reason go through the processing all over again. Once they have been determined as eligible, the monthly reporting forms which must be filled out and returned on certain dates frustrate and further discourage recipients. If the mail is late, if they lack transportation, they are often dropped from the rolls and must go through the application process all over again.

As one official cynically pointed out, "Thank God the system is so inefficient. If we were operating at peak efficiency this program would cost many millions more than it does currenty."

The impact of Federal budget cuts on state spending has trickled down to the families of the unemployed as they await needed assistance from the various entitlement programs designed to provide them with relief.

Question 5. How many people in your city participate in the food stamp program? What has been the monthly participation in the program over the last 3 years?

Answer. The 1980 census records that the city of Detroit has approximately 433,488 households. The following chart indicates the levels of monthly food stamp assistance for Detroit from September 1979 through September 1983:

	Recipients	Households
September 1979	248,092	98,783
September 1980	301,035	128,146
September 1981	315,197	136,147
September 1982	334,077	141,790
September 1983	383,655	194,086

Question 6. With regard to the food stamp program in your city, do you utilize photo identification to prevent fraud? Have you used wage matches to detect unreported income and fraudulent participation? What is the overissuance error rate in your city?

Answer. The Michigan Department of Social Services operates the Food Stamp Program. That department of State government sets identification criteria, enforces eligibility criteria and maintains statistics regarding overissuance, which they refer to as duplicate issuance.

The State would have to provide detailed and definitive answers in this area.

However, the Deputy Director of Food Programs for the State Department of Social Services informs us that their efforts to decrease duplicate issuance in the last three years have been so successful that they have been granted a waiver from the Federal Government as regards the adoption of more restrictive regulations based on their success in reducing duplicate issuance in Wayne County. For example, we have been informed that duplicate issuance was about 3 percent in 1980 and down to 0.1 percent in 1981.

A more humanitarian concern which demands our attention is the under-issuance rate, which also exists and represents much hardship to needy people.

Question 7. Regarding the special distribution program for surplus commodities, what income criteria or other standards of eligibility have been in effect in your city since the program was initiated in December, 1981 and what are they currently?

Answer. The State of Michigan has directed that the State Department of Labor guidelines, which are 125 percent of the Federal Poverty Guidelines be used throughout the State in all communities which are participating in the commodities distribution program with the approval of the United States Department of Agriculture. We have been told that USDA is currently developing more uniform guidelines for this program.

Question 8. Do you have any statistics on the income or other characteristics of those who have been served by the commodity distribution program in your city? Do you have any information on what percentage may be also receiving food stamps?

Answer. The following characteristics have been compiled on households who have registered for USDA surplus commodities:

Income level	*Registrants (percent)*
Less than $4,860 annually	69
Less than $6,540 annually	84
Less than $8,220 annually	90
Food stamp households	59
AFDC households	25
General assistance households	22
Social security households	31
Senior citizens	22
Handicapped	5

Question 9. Would you outline the amount of surplus commodities that have been distributed in your city during each of the months since the program was first announced in December 1981? Has the city contributed any money to the distribution effort?

Answer. Surplus commodity distribution in Detroit since December 1981, is outlined below:

Distribution effort?	*Pounds distributed*
March 1982	123,985
April 1982	108,070
June 1982	235,200
September 1982	168,000
December 1982	468,865
January 1983	797,422
February 1983	1,056,048
March 1983	982,602
April 1983	651,810
May 1983	1,157,520
June 1983	424,360
July 1983	0
August 1983	696,032

The USDA Commodities Distribution Program cuts across six different city departments in terms of staffing and resources. A cost factor is currently being developed. But the effects of the distribution of surplus commodities in terms of costs to the city extend far beyond the limit of city government.

The hundreds of community-based organizations who assist the city distribution network and transport commodities to distribution sites throughout the city of Detroit must be included in any assessment of cost.

Once commodities reach the city they must be stored in warehouses pending actual distribution. To ready the commodities for distribution, in addition to city staff and others unloading on average of perhaps twenty semi-trailer loads each month into warehouses, these commodities must then be reloaded onto smaller vehicles and transported to the actual distribution sites.

Physically distributing the foods, including the screening process employed to move an average of 50,000 persons through the lines each month is costly as well. A cautious estimate of these specific tasks: storage, transportation and distribution easily cost in excess of $125,000 each month.

Because we are continually diverting scarce local resources from other programs to assist with commodities distribution, we feel very strongly that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to finance the administrative costs we are currently absorbing for this Federal program.

Question 10. With regard to the school lunch program, would you provide the number of students participating in each of the three income categories, and the amount of Federal assistance received for each such category during the past 3 to 5 years? What has been the city's contribution to this program?

Answer. The following table summarizes the participation data:

SCHOOL FEEDING PROGRAM

Income level	Students per year		
	1980–81	1981–82	1982–83
Full subsidy	98,178	89,406	90,794
Partial subsidy	2,294	2,180	2,112
Fully paid by students	19,258	17,446	12,668
Total	119,730	109,032	105,574

The largest decline (34 percent) has occurred in the number of meals which are paid for by the students without benefit of government subsidy.

The number of fully subsidized meals declined by 7.5 percent. The number of partially subsidized meals declined by about 11.8 percent. During this same period, federal subsidies including USDA food contributions have declined by about 5 percent from $20.6 million in 1980 to $19.5 million in 1983. Local contributions in support of the school meals program combine Board of Education funds with revenues derived from the sale of partially subsidized and unsubsidized meals.

In 1982–83, the total from these sources is projected to reach about $5 million. In 1981–82, the total was about $7.1 million; while in 1980–81, the total was about $6.3 million.

Question 11. Would you outline what percentage of WIC recipients in your city fall into each of the six priority categories? For example, the first priority in the WIC program covers pregnant women, breastfeeding women, and infants determined to be at nutritional risk by a blood test—or some other documented medical condition.

Answer. The city of Detroit had 14,000 persons registered in the WIC Program. As of May 1983 with the sudden influx of Jobs Bill funding, an additional 8,000 slots were added. There are now approximately 22,000 persons involved in the WIC Program.

The city of Detroit Department of Public Health estimates the eligible client population for the WIC Program of nearly 70,000 persons.

Extensive initial screening resulted in the vast majority of the existing slots being filled by high priority clients: pregnant women, breastfeeding women and infants determined to have a nutrition-related health problem.

Because of the limited number of slots available, it often becomes necessary to delay provision of services to new high-priority clients and to refer low-priority clients to other potential resources for at least some of the needed services such as the provision of food.

All the current participants have at least one risk designation and many have three, so a tally would total more than the number of available slots.

Question 12. We frequently hear that there are waiting lists for participation in the WIC program. Do you have any precise statistics on what waiting lists, if any, exist in your city? What is the basis for determining whether someone participates or is added to the waiting list?

Answer. As I stated earlier, the city of Detroit Department of Public Health estimates that there are approximately 70,000 persons eligible for the WIC Program. Since there are only 22,000 slots funded currently, this means that approximately 48,000 women and children are being deprived of valuable nutritional assistance or a home when they are particularly vulnerable. This might be one explanation for the fact that there has been no appreciable change in the Infant Mortality Rate for the city of Detroit in the last year, even though the state and national statistics indicate a drop of one full percentage point.

INFANT MORTALITY RATE

[Per 1,000 live births]

	United States	State of Michigan	City of Detroit
1981	12.8	13.2	21.9
1982	11.8	12.2	21.3

Question 13. Aside from the Federal food assistance programs, does the city provide any city-financed food assistance? In what form?

Answer. In-kind contributions, staff and the resources of city government to the Senior Citizens Meals programs, Head Start, Summer Lunch programs for children, our own emergency relief programs which service 18 soup kitchens each week, staff on emergency hot line, collect and distribute emergency food bags, distribute commodities, etc. has run in excess of one million dollars over the last six months.

Question 14. As I understand it, Detroit is one of the areas which has both a WIC program and a Commodity Supplemental Food Program, both designed to assist pregnant and postpartum women and their infants and small children. What percentage of participation is in each program? Has the city considered consolidation of the programs, in order to reduce administrative expenses and insure that more dollars will actually go to providing food assistance?

Answer. The WIC program and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (Focus: HOPE) in Detroit are basically interlocking and mutually exclusive in regard to the populations and catchment areas served. They refer eligible clients to each other and the Health Department (which runs the WIC program) certifies eligibles for Focus: HOPE. There would be no significant savings consideration in a consolidation.

Question 15. Several Mayors seem to suggest support expansion of Federal food assistance programs in time of economic hardship. As the economy improves, do you support a corresponding reduction in these programs?

Answer. This Mayor is certainly among the several to whom you refer. We have consistently advanced Federal Programs based on need. As need increases relief should be increased. As economic conditions improve for people, surely realistic and humane reductions ought to be applied. But clearly, Senator, when we discuss economic recovery, we must perceive its impact in terms of human lives and not merely in terms of profits to a few.

Question 16. Several Mayors stated or seemed to imply that program changes—usually characterized as "reductions"—in Federal feeding programs had contributed to what they perceived to be increased need. What, if any, specific program changes in Federal feeding programs do you believe have contributed to what is perceived as the increasing need for food? Which, if any, of these should be restored?

Answer. Leland Hall, Director of the Office of Food Programs for the Michigan Department of Social Services states that, "Food Stamps in and of themselves are not adequate to be a sufficient source of nutrition at their current level of funding.

"The Food Stamp caseload is up 94 percent from January 1979 through April 1983. In Wayne County, 455,000 persons will receive monthly allocations of Food Stamps, 84 percent of them in the city of Detroit.

"The statistics relating the amount of benefits per family and per individual make it plain that the benefits do not fully meet food needs. For example, statewide, benefits average about $0.49 per person per meal. The amount of Food Stamps, even when combined with cash assistance and, in numerous cases, low earnings, simply has not been enough.

"The federal government has delayed, for two years any benefit adjustments resulting from food price inflation.

"This diminishes a family's purchasing power so that many people who are in need of food assistance from private charitable institutions do not have enough Food Stamps to meet their needs.

"The Food Stamp Program provides a regular avenue to dealing with hunger and malnutrition in this country. At least a part of the current emergency is best understood as a measure of that program's inadequacy."

In Detroit there has been a nearly 300 percent increase in demand for emergency food assistance at private charitable institutions. More than 65 percent of the referrals come from the Department of Social Services.

We have already cited statistics on the eligible population versus those actually enrolled in the WIC program.

The School Lunch Program has seen an increase in the number of students eligible for and participating in the free or partially subsidized lunch program. There is a direct relationship between the number of students who no longer pay for their own lunches and the increased number who require full or partial subsidy.

There has been a decline of 34 percent in the number of meals which are paid for by students without the benefit of government subsidy from 1980 to 1983.

During that same period, Federal subsidies, including USDA food contributions have declined by about 5 percent from $20.6 million in 1980 to $19.5 million in 1983.

The Michigan League for Human Services informs us that as a result of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Bill of 1981–82 which President Reagan supported and in fact signed into law, the State of Michigan lost $1,111,700 in Federal funds in the area of Social Programs, Employment and Economic Development Programs, Environmental and Education. This included TRA, CETA and unemployment benefits as well as job re-training funds. The impact felt by the State budget as a result was a total of $780,000,000 in cuts in state spending from those same areas.

The private voluntary organizations who have been forced to deal with an alarming increase in demand for services during this time are in a very inadequate position to meet that demand.

These organizations subsist mainly through volunteer contributions and volunteer staff. They have historically dealt with a small segment of the population and developed special skills for special needs categories.

They are understaffed, underfunded and ill equipped both physically and professionally to deal with their new client population.

The United Way of America, headquartered in Alexandria, Virginia, informs us that nearly 50 percent of all the agencies and organizations funded by the United Way, nationally, had received some government support in the area of Federal funds, State funds and local funds.

Drastic reductions in those areas because of a national shift in budget priorities has been extremely damaging to these organizations and extremely difficult for the United Way to resolve.

Obviously, at the very least, the federal government has a responsibility to acknowledge the facts; that there is indeed an economic emergency for millions of Americans, among them approximately 400,000 Detroiters; and actively attempt to resolve this problem.

At a time when we are hearing reports of an economic recovery, fully 35 percent of our population in Detroit is on public assistance; less than one out of every four unemployed persons is actually receiving unemployment benefits; our Infant Mortality Rate is 21.3 deaths for every 1,000 live births; thousands of our children rely on a free hot meal at school during lunch time and tens of thousands of Detroiters take their meals in soup kitchens or stand in line at neighborhood churches for a free bag of groceries.

We have seen a 35 percent increase in demand for services at our public health clinics and entitlement programs have been cut to levels which require households to decide between paying rent or freezing because they cannot pay their utility bills.

These facts, and, I emphasize the word facts, certainly demand that the Federal Government acknowledge its responsibility to its citizens to provide whatever measures of relief are required while we struggle through this economic emergency awaiting the trickle-down of economic recovery.

Our national budget priorities demand a serious review and re-examination in the following areas: improved Federal Supplemental Benefits for the unemployed, health care cost and coverage, Food Stamps and the full range of social programs designed to help the needy, to train them, to allow them to be absorbed back into the labor force to insure a truly healthy economy.

The definition of an economic recovery surely must include the welfare of all Americans not just the few at the expense of many human lives.

○

ERRATA

Effectiveness of Federal Food, Nutrition, and Surplus Commodity Distribution Programs

The above referenced hearing before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry was printed with the incomplete publication number of S. HRG. 314.

The correct designation is S. HRG. 98–314.

S161-23